arXiv:1704.08616v1 [math.QA] 27 Apr 2017

SIMPLY-LACED QUANTUM CONNECTIONS GENERALISING KZ

GABRIELE REMBADO

Abstract. We construct a new family of flat connections generalising the KZ connection, the Casimir connection and the dynamical connection. These new connections are attached to simply-laced graphs, and are obtained via quantisation of time-dependent Hamiltonian systems controlling the isomonodromic deformations of meromorphic connections on the sphere.

1. Introduction

Let m, l be positive integers. Set $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{gl}(l, \mathbb{C})$, equipped with the pairing $(\ ,\ )$ given by the trace, and let $\mathbf{B} := \mathbb{C}^m \setminus \{\text{diags}\}$, the configuration space of m-tuples of point in $\mathbb{C}$. Consider the trivial bundle $\mathbb{E} := U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m} \times \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$. The Knizhnik–Zamolodchikov (KZ) equations are the following system of linear differential equations

$$d_{\mathbf{B}}\psi = \widehat{\varpi}\psi, \qquad \widehat{\varpi} := \sum_{1\leq i\neq j\leq m} \Omega_{ij}\frac{dt_i - dt_j}{t_i - t_j}$$

for a local section ψ of $\mathbb{E}$. Here $\Omega_{ij} \in \mathrm{End}\left(U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}\right)$ is defined as the action of Ω acting in the i-th and j-th slots, where $\Omega \in \mathfrak{g}\otimes\mathfrak{g}$ corresponds to $(\ ,\ )$, and t_i are the standard coordinates on $\mathbf{B}$. Mathematically, they constitute a flat linear connection. This system originated as equations for correlation functions in WZW conformal field theory [KZ84], and their monodromy provides interesting linear representations of the m-string braid group. Moreover, the KZ connection is a genus zero analogue of the Hitchin connection (see e.g.[Egs15]).

It has been known for some years [Res92] that this linear connection can be obtained as a deformation quantisation of a system of nonlinear differential equations: the Schlesinger system

$$dR_i = \sum_{j\neq i}[R_i, R_j]\frac{dt_i - dt_j}{t_i - t_j}.$$

They control the isomonodromic deformations (IMD) of Fuchsian systems $d - \sum \frac{R_i}{z-t_i}dz$ on $\mathbb{C}P^1$, and are determined by the time-dependent Hamiltonians H_i, where

$$H_i := \sum_{j\neq i} \mathrm{Tr}\left(R_i R_j\right)\frac{dt_i - dt_j}{t_i - t_j}$$

on the trivial Poisson fibration $\pi : \mathbb{F} := \mathfrak{g}^m \times \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$. The key idea is that $\mathrm{Tr}(R_iR_j)$ becomes Ω_{ij} under the PBW quantisation map $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g}^m) \longrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g}^m)$.

Almost two decades later, various generalisations of KZ have appeared. For instance, the FMTV system (or *dynamical connection*) [FMTV00], and the DMT system (or *Casimir* connection) [MTL05], which is essentially an important special case of [FMTV00]. In brief, the space of times $\mathbf{B}$ is increased by adding on the regular part of a Cartan subalgebra.

In the case of $\mathfrak{gl}(l,\mathbb{C})$, $\mathbf{B}$ thus becomes a product $\mathbb{C}^m\setminus\{\text{diags}\}\times\mathbb{C}^l\setminus\{\text{diags}\}$. These systems also may be derived from isomonodromy via a simple deformation quantisation, but this time from an *irregular* isomonodromy problem [Boa02]. The extra times correspond to the irregular isomonodromy times considered in Jimbo–Miwa–Môri–Sato [JMMS80]. Harnad [Har94] has shown that the two collections of times in the JMMS system may be swapped, and this classical duality underlies the quantum/Howe duality of [Bau99] used in [TL02] to relate the KZ to the DMT connection for $\mathfrak{gl}(l,\mathbb{C})$.

More recently, the Hamiltonian theory of isomonodromy equations was extended [Boa12]. These new "simply-laced isomonodromy systems" (SLIMS), involve k collections of times, generalising the two collections of times in the JMMS system. In this article we show how to quantise those systems, constructing new flat connections and completing the following table:

Quantum Connection	KZ	DMT	FMTV	This work
Isomonodromy system	Schlesinger	Dual Schlesinger	JMMS	SLIMS
Space of times	$\mathbb{C}^m\setminus\{\text{diags}\}$	$\mathbb{C}^l\setminus\{\text{diags}\}$	$\mathbb{C}^m\setminus\{\text{diags}\}\times\mathbb{C}^l\setminus\{\text{diags}\}$	$\prod_1^k\mathbb{C}^{d_i}\setminus\{\text{diags}\}$

Finally, recall that the simply-laced isomonodromy systems extend a particular case of [JMU81], corresponding to complete k-partite graphs having at most one splayed node, and with all other nodes being one-dimensional (namely, one term of the "master" equation 8.4 on page 33 of [Boa12] vanishes in the setup of [JMU81]). The paper [NS11] proposed a quantisation of the isomonodromic deformation systems that occur in the intersection of the SLIMS and [JMU81].
In turn, this was one of our motivations to consider the SLIMS: they are more symmetric than [JMU81], because one can now permute all the parts. Thus, in future work we will examine the quantisation of the symmetries of [Boa12], which should simultaneously generalise [NY14] and the aforementioned [Bau99, TL02].

2. Layout of the article

In § 3 we recall the simply-laced isomonodromy systems (SLIMS). This involves a fibre bundle $\mathbb{F}=\mathbb{M}\times\mathbf{B}\longrightarrow\mathbf{B}$, and a collection of time-dependent Hamiltonian functions $H_i:\mathbb{F}\longrightarrow\mathbb{C}$. These systems are attached to complete k partite graphs.
In § 4 we realise the Hamiltonians as traces of cycles on the graph (classical potentials), and we study the Poisson bracket of such traces.
In § 5 we discuss the deformation quantisation of $\mathbb{M}$, following e.g. [Eti07]. This results in an associative filtered noncommutative algebra A.
In § 6 we define quantum potentials, which are related to the quantum algebra A similarly to how classical potentials are related to the functions on $\mathbb{M}$.
In § 7 we explain how to quantise the Hamiltonians H_i to elements $\widehat{H}_i$, thereby defining the simply-laced quantum connection (SLQC).
In § 8 and § 9 we prove the main theorem (Theorem 8) that the simply-laced quantum connection is strongly flat.

In § 10 we show that a reduction of the simply-laced quantum connection yields the KZ connection in the special case of a star-shaped graph, i.e. a complete bipartite graph where one part has only one node. This means that this SLQC quantises the Schlesinger system, because so does KZ.
In § 11 we consider the Harnad-dual data of the previous section, and we show that a natural (strongly flat) correction of the SLQC reduces to the DMT connection. This correction amounts to a reordering within the quantum Hamiltonians, and it does not tamper with the classical dynamics, as it vanishes in the semiclassical limit. This means that this SLQC quantises the dual Schlesinger system, because so does DMT.
In § 12 we put together the results of the previous two sections to show that an analogous natural correction of the SLQC reduces to the FMTV connection. Together with the fact that FMTV quantises the JMMS system, this proves that this SLQC quantises the JMMS system.
Finally, in § 13 we compare the SLQC with the quantisation [NS11] of a particular case of the JMU system. We argue that our cycle-theoretic formulation recovers part of the explicit Hamiltonian formulation for the systems that lie in the intersection of the isomonodromy equations of [Boa12] and [JMU81], as well as its quantisation. This is also the occasion for writing down the simply-laced quantum connection explicitly in rank 3, via differential operators acting on polynomial functions on $\mathbb{C}^3$.

3. Simply-laced isomonodromy systems

Fix a finite set J of cardinality k. Let $\pi : I \twoheadrightarrow J$ be a surjection, and write $I = \coprod_{j\in J} I^j$ for the induced partition of the finite set I, with parts $I^j = \pi^{-1}(j)$. Next, let $\mathcal{G}$ be the complete k-partite graph on nodes I. This means that two nodes are adjacent if and only if they lie in different parts. Both $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are by definition simply-laced, i.e. without edge loops or repeated edges.
Next, pick finite-dimensional complex vector spaces $\{V_i\}_{i\in I}$, as well as an embedding

$$a : J \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}\coprod\{\infty\}, \quad j \longmapsto a_j,$$

called the reading of $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$. The reading is said to be generic if $\infty \notin a(J)$, and degenerate otherwise.

One also attaches complex vector spaces $W^j := \bigoplus_{i\in I^j} V_i$ to the nodes of $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$, simply writing W^∞ for the (possibly nonexistent) space associated to the node $j \in J$ such that $a_j = \infty$. Finally, let us abusively denote by $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ the double quiver associated to the graph $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$: it is the quiver on nodes I having a pair of antiparallel arrows for each edge of $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$. The same abuse of notation will be taken for $\mathcal{G}$.

These data determine a base space of times

$$\mathbf{B} := \prod_{j\in J} \mathbb{C}^{I^j} \setminus \{\text{diags}\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^I,$$

and a symplectic vector space

$$\mathbb{M} := \bigoplus_{i\neq j\in J} \mathrm{Hom}\left(W^i, W^j\right),$$

with symplectic form

$$\omega_a := \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i\neq j\in J} \mathrm{Tr}\left(dX^{ij} \wedge dB^{ji}\right).$$

Notice that $\mathbb{M}$ is the space of representations of the quiver $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ with respect to the vector spaces $\{W^j\}_{j\in J}$, and one thus denotes $B^{ji} : W^i \longrightarrow W^j$ the linear maps defined by one representation; also, one defines $X^{ij} : W^j \longrightarrow W^i$ to be the scalar multiplication of B^{ij} by the weight $\phi_{ij} \in \mathbb{C}$, where

$$\phi_{ij} = -\phi_{ji} := \begin{cases} (a_i - a_j)^{-1}, & a_i, a_j \neq \infty \\ 1, & a_i = \infty \end{cases}.$$

Consider now the trivial symplectic fibration $\mathbb{F}_a := (\mathbb{M}, \omega_a) \times \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$. The space $\mathbb{F}_a$ parametrises certain meromorphic connections on the trivial vector bundle

$$U^\infty \times \mathbb{C}P^1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}P^1$$

with fibre $U^\infty := \bigoplus_{j:a_j\neq\infty} W^j$. Namely, write

$$\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} T^\infty & Q \\ P & B+T \end{pmatrix}$$

for a generic element of $\mathrm{End}(W^\infty \oplus U^\infty)$, where

$$\Gamma := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & P \\ Q & B \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{M}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \widehat{T} := \begin{pmatrix} T^\infty & 0 \\ 0 & T \end{pmatrix},$$

are the off-diagonal part of γ and the diagonal of γ, respectively. One assumes that the restriction T^j of γ to W^j is semisimple for all $j \in J$. Now, to a point $(\Gamma, \widehat{T}) \in \mathbb{F}_a$ one associates the connection

$$\nabla = d - \mathcal{A} := d - \big(Az + (B+T) + Q(z - T^\infty)^{-1}P\big)dz,$$

where

$$A := \sum_{j:a_j\neq\infty} a_j \,\mathrm{Id}_j \in \mathrm{End}(U^\infty),$$

and Id_j is the idempotent for W^j. Recall the following result, from [Boa12].

Theorem 1. *The isomonodromy deformation (IMD) equations for the meromorphic connections above admit an Hamiltonian formulation. Moreover, the Hamiltonian system $H_i : \mathbb{F}_a \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is strongly flat:*

$$\{H_i, H_j\} = 0 = \frac{\partial H_i}{\partial t_j} - \frac{\partial H_j}{\partial t_i}, \qquad \textit{for } i \neq j.$$

Recall that the IMD equations are nonlinear first order PDEs for Γ, as a function of $\widehat{T}$. The fact that this problem admits an Hamiltonian formulation means that one can find functions $\{H_i\}_{i\in I}$ as above, such that the differential equations can be written

$$\frac{\partial \Gamma_j}{\partial t_i} = \{H_i, \Gamma_j\}$$

for all components Γ_i of a local section Γ of the fibration. The definition of the Hamiltonians is implicitly given by defining the horizontal 1-form $\varpi = \sum_{i\in I} H_i dt_i$ as

$$\varpi := \frac{1}{2}\left(\widetilde{\Xi\Gamma}\delta(\Xi\Gamma)\right) - \mathrm{Tr}\left(\Xi\gamma\Xi d\widehat{T}\right) + \mathrm{Tr}\left(X^2 T dT\right) + \mathrm{Tr}\left(PAQT^\infty dT^\infty\right). \qquad (1)$$

Here one sets $\Xi := \phi(\Gamma)$ and $X := \phi(B)$, applying the alternating weights $\phi_{ij} \in \mathbb{C}$ componentwise. Also, $\delta(\Xi\Gamma)$ denotes the diagonal part of $\Xi\Gamma$ in the direct sum decomposition $W^\infty \oplus U^\infty = \bigoplus_{j\in J} W^j$, and one defines

$$\widetilde{\Xi\Gamma} := \mathrm{ad}_{\widehat{T}}^{-1}\left[\widehat{T}, \Xi\Gamma\right].$$

Notice that the functions H_i can also be thought of as global sections of the vector bundle

$$A_0 \times \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$$

where $A_0 := \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M}) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(\mathbb{M}^*)$ is the algebra of regular function on the affine complex space $\mathbb{M}$. The Hamiltonians H_i are by definition the simply-laced isomonodromy system (SLIMS). This is the classical system we wish to quantise.

4. Potentials

Consider again the complete k-partite quiver $\mathcal{G}$ on nodes $I = \coprod_{j\in J} I^j$.

Definition 4.1. A potential W on $\mathcal{G}$ is a $\mathbb{C}$-linear combination of oriented cycles in $\mathcal{G}$, defined up to cyclic permutations of their arrows. The space of potentials is denoted $\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}$.

Every potential $W \in \mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}$ defines a regular function on $\mathbb{M}$, by taking the traces of its cycles. Thus a (multi) time-dependent potential $W : \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}$ will define a global section $\mathrm{Tr}(W) : \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow A_0$. Introducing the natural notation $I^i := \pi^{-1}(\pi(i)) \subseteq I$ for the part of I containing the node $i \in I$, consider the following potentials:

$$\begin{aligned} W_i(2) &:= \sum_{j\in I\setminus I^i} (t_i - t_j)\alpha_{ij}\alpha_{ji} \\ W_i(3) &:= \sum_{j,l\in I\setminus I^i : I^j \neq I^l} (a_j - a_l)\alpha_{il}\alpha_{lj}\alpha_{ji} \\ W_i(4) &:= \sum_{m\in I^i\setminus\{i\}, j,l\in I\setminus I^i} (a_i - a_j)(a_i - a_l)\frac{\alpha_{ij}\alpha_{jm}\alpha_{ml}\alpha_{li}}{t_i - t_m} \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where α_{ij} is the arrow from $j \in I$ to $i \in I$ in $\mathcal{G}$. We agree to write a cycle in $\mathcal{G}$ as the sequence of its arrows, reading from right to left.

Proposition 2. *The Hamiltonian H_i of the simply-laced isomonodromy system is the sum of the traces of these potentials, for a generic reading of $\mathcal{G}$:*

$$H_i = \mathrm{Tr}(W_i(4)) + \mathrm{Tr}(W_i(3)) + \mathrm{Tr}(W_i(2)).$$

Moreover, in a degenerate reading one only needs to change the weights of the same types of cycles.

Proof. It follows from an explicit expansion of the formula for ϖ. □

This in particular implies that the flatness does not depend in a crucial way on whether the reading is generic or not. Let us now introduce some terminology, for further use.

Definition 4.2. The potentials $W_i(n)$ above are called the (classical) IMD potentials, for $i \in I, 2 \leq n \leq 4$. Their addends will be referred to as the IMD cycles. The IMD 4-cycles can be further divided in two families:

(1) nondegenerate, if they touch 4 distinct nodes of $\mathcal{G}$.

(2) degenerate, if they touch 3 distinct nodes of $\mathcal{G}$.

This provides the following types of cycles:



In order from left to right, one has 2-cycles, 3-cycles, nondegenerate 4-cycles and degenerate 4-cycles. Notice that the degenerate 4-cycle are the glueing of two 2-cycles at a node, that will be called their centre. The other two nodes must lie in one and the same part of I.

There is also an intrinsic way to think of traces. Namely, if $C = \alpha_n \dots \alpha_1$ is an oriented cycle in $\mathcal{G}$ starting at a node $i \in I$, and for all representation $\rho \in \mathbb{M}$ of $\mathcal{G}$, one gets an endomorphism $\rho^C = \rho^{\alpha_n} \circ \dots \circ \rho^{\alpha_1}$ of V_i. However, this object can also be thought as living in $A_0 \otimes \mathrm{End}(V_i)$, since all its components define regular functions on $\mathbb{M}$. Now taking traces amounts to contract V_i and V_i^*, leaving a function $\mathrm{Tr}(C) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho^C) \in A_0$.

As a last remark, there is a natural (positively) graded Lie structure $\{,\}$ on $\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}$, where the gradation is given by cycle length, called the necklace Lie algebra structure (see e.g. [BLB02, Eti07]). We shall call $C \in \mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}$ an m-cycle if it has m arrows, and also set $l(C) := m$ in that case. Also, if α is an arrow in $\mathcal{G}$, we write α^* for its (unique) antiparallel one.

Definition 4.3. Pick two oriented cycles $C_1 = \alpha_n \dots \alpha_1$ and $C_2 = \beta_m \dots \beta_1$ in $\mathcal{G}$. The Lie bracket $\{C_1, C_2\}$ is a weighted sum of $(n+m-2)$-cycles obtained as follows. For all pairs of antiparallel arrows $\alpha_i, \beta_j = \alpha_i^*$, one deletes that pair and glues together the two remaining cycles.
The weights are determined by the defining relation of the Poisson bracket of A_0.

To see this graphically, fix a pair i, j such that $\alpha_i = \beta_j^*$, and introduce the notation $t(\alpha), h(\alpha) \in I$ for the tail and the head of an arrow α in $\mathcal{G}$, respectively; these are the starting node of α and the end node of α, respectively. Set then $a = t(\beta_{j-1}), b = h(\beta_{j-1}) = h(\alpha_i), c = h(\beta_j) = h(\alpha_{i-1}), d = h(\beta_{j+1}), e = t(\alpha_{i-1}), f = h(\alpha_{i+1}) \in I$. Then the local picture before deleting arrows looks like this:



Afterwards, one will have:



Now, the nice fact is that this bracket comes from the Poisson structure of A_0.

Proposition 3. *One has*

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left\{C_1, C_2\right\} = \{\mathrm{Tr}(C_1), \mathrm{Tr}(C_2)\} \in A_0$$

for all cycles $C_1, C_2 \in \mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}$.

The proof consists of a direct expansion of the Poisson bracket

$$\{\mathrm{Tr}(C_1), \mathrm{Tr}(C_2)\} = \{\mathrm{Tr}(X^{\alpha_n} \dots X^{\alpha_1}), \mathrm{Tr}(X^{\beta_m} \dots X^{\beta_1})\},$$

which will be provided in the appendix § 14. Conceptually, however, what happens is the following. The invariant regular functions on $\mathbb{M}$ for the action of $G := \prod_{j\in J} \mathrm{GL}_{\mathbb{C}}(W^j)$ consist of the $\mathbb{C}$-algebra $A_0^G \subseteq A_0$ generated by traces of cycles. Hence we have an injective map $\mathrm{Tr} : \mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}} \hookrightarrow A_0^G$, and the above discussion shows that this is a Lie algebras' morphism: the necklace Lie bracket is the pull-back of the Poisson bracket on A_0.

Last, notice that it is not possible to upgrade $\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}$ to a Poisson algebra using the natural concatenation product, since $\mathrm{Tr}(AB) \neq \mathrm{Tr}(A)\,\mathrm{Tr}(B)$ for general endomorphisms A, B of a vector space. Rather, one should define a formal product of cycles that satisfies the same rules as the product of their traces, i.e. be commutative. This is well expressed by the following elementary algebraic fact.

Proposition 4. *Pick a complex vector space A together with a linear embedding $\iota : V \hookrightarrow B$ into a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra. Then there is a natural tensor map $\mathrm{Tens}(\iota) : \mathrm{Tens}(V) \longrightarrow B$, defined on pure tensors as*

$$\mathrm{Tens}(\iota)(v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_n) := \iota_1(v) \dots \iota_n(v) \in B.$$

This map is surjective on the subalgebra $B.\iota(V) \subseteq B$ generated by the image of ι in B, and it induces an isomorphism of algebras

$$\mathrm{Tens}(V)/\,\mathrm{Ker}(\mathrm{Tens}(\iota)) \cong B.\iota(V).$$

This is an application of the universal properties of tensor products and quotients. In the case at hand, one just finds

$$A_0^G \cong \mathrm{Tens}(\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}})/\,\mathrm{Ker}(\mathrm{Tens}(\mathrm{Tr})) = \mathrm{Sym}(\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}),$$

so that it makes sense to define

$$A_0^{\mathcal{G}} := \mathrm{Sym}(\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}).$$

The identification $A_0^G \cong A_0^{\mathcal{G}}$ is just saying that all G-invariant regular functions on $\mathbb{M}$ are monomials of (traces of) cycles, with commutative variables. Notice that the Lie bracket of $\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}$ is now tautologically upgraded to a Poisson bracket, and $A_0^{\mathcal{G}}$ is isomorphic to A_0^G as a graded commutative Poisson algebra. We shall present a quantum counterpart of this, in § 6.

As an application of this cycle-theoretic viewpoint, one can provide a direct proof of "half" of the strong flatness of the SLIMS. More precisely, remark that one has

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\partial_{t_i} W_j) = \partial_{t_i} \mathrm{Tr}(W_j)$$

for all $i, j \in I$, where W_j is an IMD potential. This is because the derivative does not modify the cycles that make up the potentials, but only their weights. Hence showing that $\partial_{t_i} H_j - \partial_{t_j} H_i = 0$ is equivalent to showing that $\partial_{t_i} W_j - \partial_{t_j} W_i = 0$, because of the injectivity of $\mathrm{Tr} : \mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}} \hookrightarrow A_0$.

Proposition 5. *One has $\partial_{t_i} W_j = \partial_{t_j} W_i$ for all $i, j \in I$.*

Proof. One can clearly assume $i \neq j \in I$. Then one has

$$\partial_{t_j} W_i(2) = \begin{cases} -\alpha_{ij}\alpha_{ji}, & I^i \neq I^j \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \partial_{t_i} W_j(2) = \begin{cases} -\alpha_{ji}\alpha_{ij}, & I^i \neq I^j \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases}.$$

Also

$$\partial_{t_j} W_i(3) = 0 = \partial_{t_i}(W_j),$$

since all 3-cycles are actually time-independent in our setting. Finally,

$$\partial_{t_j} W_i(4) = \begin{cases} \sum_{m,l \in I \setminus I^i} (a_i - a_m)(a_i - a_l) \frac{\alpha_{im}\alpha_{mj}\alpha_{jl}\alpha_{li}}{(t_i - t_j)^2}, & I^i = I^j \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\partial_{t_i} W_j(4) = \begin{cases} \sum_{m,l \in I \setminus I^j} (a_j - a_m)(a_j - a_l) \frac{\alpha_{jl}\alpha_{li}\alpha_{im}\alpha_{mj}}{(t_j - t_i)^2}, & I^i = I^j \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases}.$$

This is seen explicitly on the formulas (2), and proves the claim, because

$$\alpha_{ij}\alpha_{ji} = \alpha_{ji}\alpha_{ij} \in \mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \alpha_{jl}\alpha_{li}\alpha_{im}\alpha_{mj} = \alpha_{im}\alpha_{mj}\alpha_{jl}\alpha_{li} \in \mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}.$$

For the case of 4-cycles, one must also recall that $a_i = a_j$ if $I^i = I^j$, because the reading only depends on the parts of I. □

5. Quantisation: algebras

Consider again the commutative Poisson algebra $A_0 = \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M}) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(\mathbb{M}^*)$ of regular functions $\mathbb{M}$.

Definition 5.1. A one-parameter deformation quantisation of A_0 is a topologically free $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$-algebra $\widehat{A}$, together with an identification $\widehat{A}/\hbar\widehat{A} \cong A_0$, such that the Poisson bracket $\{\cdot,\cdot\}$ of A_0 is naturally induced by the commutator $[\cdot,\cdot]$ of $\widehat{A}$:

$$\{x, y\} = \frac{1}{\hbar}[\widehat{x}, \widehat{y}] + O(\hbar),$$

where $x, y \in A_0, \widehat{x}, \widehat{y} \in \widehat{A}$ are arbitrary lifts, and the analytical Landau notation $O(\hbar)$ stands for an arbitrary element of the ideal $\hbar\widehat{A} \subseteq \widehat{A}$ generated by $\hbar$.

In the case we consider one can avoid using $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$-modules, by performing filtered quantisation (see [Eti07]).

5.1. **The Weyl algebra.**

There exists an associative (noncommutative) filtered algebra A whose associated graded is canonically isomorphic to A_0. Moreover, if one denotes $\sigma : A \longrightarrow \mathrm{gr}(A) \cong A_0$ the grading map, then one has

$$\sigma\big[\widehat{x}, \widehat{y}\big] = \{x, y\}, \tag{3}$$

for $x, y \in A_0$ and for any lift $\widehat{x}, \widehat{y} \in A$. The algebra A is defined as follows.

Definition 5.2. Set

$$A = W(\mathbb{M}, \omega_a) := \mathrm{Tens}(\mathbb{M})/I_{\omega_a},$$

where $\mathrm{Tens}(\mathbb{M})$ is the tensor algebra of the vector space $\mathbb{M}$, and $I_{\omega_a} \subseteq \mathrm{Tens}(\mathbb{M})$ is the two-sided ideal generated by elements of the form

$$x \otimes y - y \otimes x - \omega_a(x, y),$$

for $x, y \in \mathbb{M}$. This is the Weyl algebra of the symplectic vector space $(\mathbb{M}, \omega_a)$.

The filtration of A is the quotient filtration induced by the natural filtration of $\mathrm{Tens}(\mathbb{M})$. Notice that there is a canonical linear isomorphism $\varphi : \mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}^*$, induced by the nondegenerate pairing $\mathbb{M} \wedge \mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ provided by the symplectic form ω_a. Moreover, there is a unique symplectic structure on $\mathbb{M}^*$ such that φ is a symplectomorphism, which we abusively denote ω_a as well. The Weyl algebra $W(\mathbb{M}^*, \omega_a)$ of the dual symplectic space is then canonically isomorphic to A, and it is not really necessary to distinguish the two, as far as generator and relations are concerned.[1] The intrinsic way of thinking about this is the following. The symplectic vector space $(\mathbb{M}, \omega_a)$ is equipped with a Poisson bracket $\{\cdot, \cdot\} : \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M}) \wedge \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M}) \longrightarrow \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})$ such that the degree of the polynomial function $\{f, g\}$ equals $\deg(f)+\deg(g)-2$, for $f, g \in \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})$. In particular, its restriction to linear functions yields an alternating bilinear map $\{\cdot, \cdot\} : \mathbb{M}^* \wedge \mathbb{M}^* \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Thus one may say that the Weyl algebra is obtained from the tensor algebra by modding out the Poisson structure, just as for the universal enveloping algebras $U(\mathfrak{g})$ of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$.

Finally, consider the composition $\sigma \circ \pi : \mathrm{Tens}(\mathbb{M}^*) \longrightarrow \mathrm{gr}(A)$ of the canonical projection $\pi : \mathrm{Tens}(\mathbb{M}^*) \longrightarrow A$ with the grading map $\sigma : A \longrightarrow \mathrm{gr}(A)$. One may show that this vanishes precisely on the homogeneous two-sided ideal $I_0 \subseteq \mathrm{Tens}(\mathbb{M}^*)$ generated by commutators, thus inducing an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{gr}(A) \cong \mathrm{Tens}(\mathbb{M}^*)/I_0 = \mathrm{Sym}(\mathbb{M}^*) \cong A_0.$$

The quantisation identity (3) can be shown by a direct inspection on elements of order one, which generate A_0. There is now a universal way of reconstructing a $\hbar$-deformation quantisation of A_0 from A.

5.2. **Rees construction.**

Consider an associative positively filtered algebra $B = \bigcup_{k \geq 0} B_{\leq k}$. Recall that one calls

$$\mathrm{ord}(b) := \min\{k \geq 0 \mid b \in B_{\leq k}\}$$

the order of the element $b \in B$.

[1] The canonical isomorphism is given by the universal property of the quotient applied to the composition $\pi \circ \mathrm{Tens}(\varphi) : \mathrm{Tens}(\mathbb{M}) \longrightarrow W(\mathbb{M}^*, \omega_a)$, where $\mathrm{Tens}(\varphi) : \mathrm{Tens}(\mathbb{M}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Tens}(\mathbb{M}^*)$ is the image of φ under the functor Tens, and $\pi : \mathbb{M}^* \longrightarrow W(\mathbb{M}^*, \omega_a)$ is the canonical projection.

Definition 5.3. The Rees algebra $\mathrm{Rees}(B)$ of B is the $\mathbb{C}[\hbar]$-algebra defined by

$$\mathrm{Rees}(B) := \bigoplus_{k\geq 0} B_{\leq k}\hbar^k \subseteq B[\hbar].$$

Proposition 6. *There exists a topologically-free $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$-algebra $\widehat{A}$ that defines a deformation quantisation of A_0. It is obtained via (a completion of) the Rees algebra of A.*

Proof. It suffices to set:

$$\widehat{A} := \left\{ \sum_{k\geq 0} d_k\hbar^k \,\middle|\, d_k \in A_{\leq k} \text{ for all } k\geq 0, \lim_{k\longrightarrow+\infty}(k-\mathrm{ord}(d_k)) = +\infty \right\} \subseteq A[[\hbar]].$$

One can indeed show that the map

$$\varphi : \sum_{k\geq 0} d_k\hbar^k \longmapsto \sum_{k\geq 0} \sigma_k(d_k)$$

induces a (canonical) isomorphism $\widehat{A}/\hbar\widehat{A} \cong A_0$. Here $\sigma_k : A_{\leq k} \longrightarrow A_{\leq k}/A_{\leq k-1} \cong (A_0)_k$ is the order k part of the grading map, that is the canonical projection. Moreover, the identity of the relevant Poisson brackets follows from (3). □

Thanks to this universal construction, it makes sense to speak of the Weyl algebra A as a quantisation of A_0. This is the first step to actually quantise observables $f \in A_0$, that is to provide a map $f \longmapsto \widehat{f}$ that is a section of the semiclassical limit σ (among other properties which are not crucial to list at present). Nonetheless, there is a natural way to quantise elements of order 1, i.e. linear functions on $\mathbb{M}$. Namely, one considers the composition $\pi\circ\iota : \mathbb{M}^* \longrightarrow \mathrm{Tens}(\mathbb{M}^*) \longrightarrow A$ of the canonical embedding $\iota : \mathbb{M}^* \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Tens}(\mathbb{M}^*)$ with the canonical projection $\pi : \mathrm{Tens}(\mathbb{M}^*) \longrightarrow A$, and sets $\widehat{f} := \pi(\iota(f))$ for all linear functions $f : \mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$. This is well defined because the ideal I_{ω_a} defining the Weyl algebra does not intersect the space $\mathrm{Tens}(\mathbb{M}^*)_{\leq 1} = \mathbb{C}\oplus\mathbb{M}^*$.

6. Quantisation: potentials

Just as we coded (invariant) functions on $\mathbb{M}$ via cycles, we can code quantum operators via decorated cycles. Consider again a complete k-partite quiver $\mathcal{G}$.

Definition 6.1. An anchored cycle $\widehat{C}$ is an oriented cycle in $\mathcal{G}$ with a starting arrow fixed, to be called the anchor of $\widehat{C}$. We will denote this by underlining the anchor:

$$\widehat{C} = \alpha_n \ldots \underline{\alpha_1},$$

where $\alpha_n, \ldots, \alpha_1$ are arrows in $\mathcal{G}$.

The idea is the following. Using the above "linear quantisation" $X \longmapsto \widehat{X} : A_0 \longrightarrow A$ one can now associate $n!$ different quantum operators to all monomial $f = X_1 \ldots X_n$ of degree n; namely, one has

$$\widehat{X}_{\sigma(1)} \ldots \widehat{X}_{\sigma(n)} \in A_{\leq n},$$

for all permutation $\sigma \in \Sigma_n$ on n objects. There is in general no canonical way to pick one of them. This is the main issue of quantisation: extending the quantisation $X \longmapsto \widehat{X}$ of linear functions to a full quantisation $f \longmapsto \widehat{f} : A_0 \longrightarrow A$.

Nevertheless, suppose that $f \in A_0$ is a monomial coming from the trace of a cycle $C = \alpha_n \dots \alpha_1 \in \mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\text{cycl}}$. This means that f is one monomial of the sum

$$\mathrm{Tr}(C) = \sum_K X^{\alpha_n}_{k_n,k_{n-1}} \dots X^{\alpha_1}_{k_1,k_n} \in A_0,$$

where $K = (k_n, \dots, k_1)$ is an appropriate multi-index. Now, if one picks an anchor for C, say that $\widehat{C} := \alpha_n \dots \underline{\alpha_1}$, then the quantum operator

$$\widehat{f} := \sum_{K \in D_C} \widehat{X}^{\alpha_n}_{k_n,k_{n-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_1}_{k_1,k_n} \in A_{\leq n}$$

is uniquely defined, and one can in turn define $\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{C}) \in A$ to be that operator. In hindsight, and more intrinsecally, one could just consider the operator-valued matrix

$$\widehat{\rho}^{\widehat{C}} := \widehat{X}^{\alpha_n} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_1} \in A \otimes \mathrm{End}(V_i),$$

where $i := t(\alpha_1) \in I$ is the starting node of $\widehat{C}$. Taking trace then amounts again to contracting V_i against V_i^*.

As a final remark, notice that two different anchored cycles $\widehat{C}_1, \widehat{C}_2$ may define the same quantum operator. This happens when their two underlying cycles coincide under an "admissible" permutation of their arrows: no arrow α may pass over its antiparallel α^*. This is because the entries of matrices $\widehat{X}^\alpha, \widehat{X}^\beta$ commute if and only if $\alpha \neq \beta^*$, according to the defining relations of the Weyl algebra. This motivates the next definitions.

Definition 6.2. Consider an anchored cycle $\widehat{C} = \alpha_n \dots \underline{\alpha_1}$ on $\mathcal{G}$. An admissible permutation of its arrows consists in dividing the word $\alpha_n \dots \alpha_1$ in two subwords

$$A = \alpha_n \dots \alpha_{n-i}, \qquad B = \alpha_{n-i-1} \dots \alpha_1$$

such that no arrow in A has its antiparallel in B, and to swap A and B. This yields a new anchored cycle $\widehat{C}' = \alpha_{n-i-1} \dots \alpha_1 \alpha_n \dots \underline{\alpha_i}$.

Definition 6.3. Let $\widehat{\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\text{cycl}}}$ be the complex vector space spanned by anchored cycles in $\mathcal{G}$, defined up to admissible permutations of their arrows. Its elements will be called quantum potentials, its generators quantum cycles.
One denotes by $\sigma : \widehat{\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\text{cycl}}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}$ the map that forgets the anchor, which we call again the semiclassical limit. A quantum potential $\widehat{W}$ is a quantisation of the potential W if $\sigma(\widehat{W}) = W$.

There exists now a well defined $\mathbb{C}$-linear injective map $\mathrm{Tr} : \widehat{\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\text{cycl}}} \hookrightarrow A$, together with a commutative square where the quantum and classical traces intertwine the semiclassical limit: $\sigma\big(\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{C})\big) = \mathrm{Tr}(C) \in A_0$ for all quantum cycles $\widehat{C} \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\text{cycl}}}$ that quantises the classical cycle $C \in \mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\text{cycl}}$. Moreover, one can use Prop. 4 to produce a cycle-theoretic analogue of the Weyl algebra. Namely, one considers the tensor map

$$\mathrm{Tens}(\mathrm{Tr}) : \mathrm{Tens}(\widehat{\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\text{cycl}}}) \longrightarrow A,$$

which is surjective on the subalgebra $A^G \subseteq A$ of A, which is by definition the subalgebra generated by traces of quantum cycles. One thus has an isomorphism of associative algebras

$$\mathrm{Tens}(\widehat{\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\text{cycl}}})/\,\mathrm{Ker}(\mathrm{Tens}(\mathrm{Tr})) \cong A^G.$$

Now, setting $A^{\mathcal{G}}$ to be the quotient on the left-hand side, one has constructed an associative (quantum) algebra that has an analogous relation with A^G as $A_0^{\mathcal{G}}$ has with A_0^G. Notice that this is abstract, as we do not have a nice description of the kernel of the quantum trace map. However, one still has an identification

$$\mathbb{C} \oplus \widehat{\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}} \cong A^{\mathcal{G}}_{\leq 1},$$

with respect to the quotient filtration on $A^{\mathcal{G}}$. Indeed, this happens because Tens(Tr) is by definition the identity on $\mathbb{C}$ (trace of empty cycles, if one will), and it is injective on the vector space generated by quantum cycles.

Finally, notice that $A^{\mathcal{G}}$ now has a well defined product, defined on quantum cycles by

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left(\widehat{C}_1\widehat{C}_2\right) = \mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{C_1})\,\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{C_2}) \in A.$$

This is basically a $\star$-product, deforming the commutative one of $A_0^{\mathcal{G}}$. This makes $A^{\mathcal{G}}$ into a filtered associative algebra, still provided with a semiclassical limit

$$\sigma : A^{\mathcal{G}} \longrightarrow A_0^{\mathcal{G}},$$

which is defined on monomials by forgetting anchors $\sigma : \widehat{C}_1 \dots \widehat{C}_n \longmapsto \sigma(\widehat{C}_1) \dots \sigma(\widehat{C}_n)$.

In this noncommutative context it is even more important to allow for formal products of cycles, in order to keep track of the anchoring, as exemplified by the next proposition.

Proposition 7. *Pick two quantum cycles $\widehat{C}, \widehat{C}'$ such that their underlying classical cycles $\sigma(\widehat{C}), \sigma(\widehat{C}')$ coincide. Then their difference is a sum of products of pairs of quantum cycles whose lengths sum to $l(\widehat{C}) - 2 = l(\widehat{C}') - 2$.*

A proof of this is given in § 14.

7. Simply-laced quantum connection

The following few definitions now come naturally. Consider again the classical IMD cycles of § 4. The 3-cycles and the nondegenerate 4-cycles do not contain pairs of antiparallel arrows, so that one can quantise such a cycle C by choosing any anchor: all of them are equivalent. As for 2-cycles and degenerate 4-cycles, one makes the following choices.

Definition 7.1. The quantisation of a degenerate 4-cycles is the quantum cycle having the same underlying classical cycle, anchored at any arrow coming out of its centre. The quantisation of a two cycle $C =$ is by definition the quantum potential

$\widehat{C} = \frac{1}{2}\Big($  $\Big)$.

In this picture and in all that follow, the black nodes are the tail of the anchor. As for the degenerate 4-cycles, a priori specifying a starting arrow is more than specifying a starting node, but in this case there is no ambiguity: changing the order of the arrows coming out of the central node amounts to an admissible permutation of the arrows of the degenerate 4-cycles. This is because such a cycle can be written as a word $C = \beta^*\beta\alpha^*\alpha$, where α, β are the two distinct arrows of $\mathcal{G}$ coming out of the centre. Now, the two possible anchors at the centre correspond to the quantisations $\widehat{C}_1 = \beta^*\beta\alpha^*\underline{\alpha}$ and $\widehat{C}_2 = \alpha^*\alpha\beta^*\underline{\beta}$. These two are seen to be equal, by means of the cyclical permutation that swaps the two 2-cycles: one can move $\beta^*\beta$ to the right of $\alpha^*\alpha$ without changing the relative order of the antiparallel pairs $(\alpha, \alpha^*), (\beta, \beta^*)$.

This is totally canonical, and does not rely on a full quantisation $\mathcal{Q} : A_0 \longrightarrow A$. One can however show that it amounts to correcting the standard Weyl quantisation. Consider now the IMD potentials $W_i = W_i(4) + W_i(3) + W_i(2) \in \mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\text{cycl}}$ of (2).

Definition 7.2. The quantum IMD potential $\widehat{W_i} \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\text{cycl}}}$ at the node i is the sum of the quantisations of its IMD cycles. The quantum IMD Hamiltonian $\widehat{H}_i : \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow A$ is the trace of the quantum IMD potential at the node i: $\widehat{H}_i := \mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{W_i})$.

This is a quantisation of the classical IMD Hamiltonian $H_i : \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow A_0$, in the sense that the identity $\sigma(\widehat{H}_i) = H_i$ is true everywhere on $\mathbf{B}$. Consider now the trivial bundle $\mathbb{E}_a := A \times \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$.

Definition 7.3. The (universal) simply-laced quantum connection (SLQC) $\widehat{\nabla}$ is the connection on $\mathbb{E}_a$ defined by

$$\widehat{\nabla} := d_{\mathbf{B}} - \widehat{\varpi}, \qquad \text{where } \widehat{\varpi} := \sum_{i \in I} \widehat{H}_i dt_i.$$

Note that $\Omega^1(\mathbf{B}, A) \subseteq \Omega^1\big(\mathbf{B}, \mathrm{End}(\mathbb{E}_a)\big)$, where one lets $\widehat{H}_i$ act linearly on the fibre A of $\mathbb{E}_a$ by left multiplication. The main result is the following.

Theorem 8. *$\widehat{\nabla}$ is strongly flat, i.e.*

$$\big[\widehat{H}_i, \widehat{H}_j\big] = 0 = \frac{\partial \widehat{H}_i}{\partial t_j} - \frac{\partial \widehat{H}_j}{\partial t_i}, \qquad \textit{for } i, j \in I.$$

8. Proof of strong flatness: I

Let us show that

$$\partial_{t_i} \widehat{H}_j - \partial_{t_j} \widehat{H}_i = 0$$

for all $i, j \in I$. This follows from a lemma.

Lemma 9. *Pick a classical IMD potential $W_i : \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}$. Then*

$$\partial_{t_j} \widehat{W_i} = \widehat{\partial_{t_j} W_i}, \qquad \partial_{t_j} \mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{W_i}) = \mathrm{Tr}(\partial_{t_j} \widehat{W_i}),$$

for all $j \in I$.

Proof. The first set of identities are due to the fact that the quantisation does not depend on $\mathbf{B}$. Moreover, as already mentioned at the end of § 4, tacking a derivative does not change the type of cycles that make up the potential, but only modifies their weights. This means that the quantisation $\widehat{\partial_{t_j} W_i}$ is well defined, and that taking traces (both of classical and quantum potentials) commutes with picking derivatives. □

Using the second set of identities of the lemma, it is thus enough to verify that one has $\partial_{t_i} \widehat{W_j} - \partial_{t_j} \widehat{W_i} = 0$ for all $i, j \in I$, because the trace of the left-hand side is precisely the difference $\partial_{t_i} \widehat{H}_j - \partial_{t_j} \widehat{H}_i$. Finally, to prove this, one exploits Thm. 1, borrowing the statement

$$\partial_{t_i} W_j = \partial_{t_j} W_i.$$

This is precisely Prop. 5, which implies that

$$\widehat{\partial_{t_i} W_j} = \widehat{\partial_{t_j} W_i}.$$

Then the first set of identity of the above lemma permits to conclude. Notice that crucial fact that the quantisation is "symmetric on $\mathcal{G}$", in the sense that the quantisation $\widehat{H}_i$ of the Hamiltonian H_i does not depend on the base node $i \in I$.

9. Proof of strong flatness: II

One is left to show that the quantum IMD Hamiltonians commute. By bilinearity, this reduces to the problem of computing commutators of the form

$$\left[\operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{C}_1), \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{C}_2)\right] \in A$$

where $\widehat{C}_1, \widehat{C}_2$ are quantum IMD cycles.

Commutators of quantum cycles.

The first thing to do is to see whether one can still write this element in terms of traces of quantum cycles. Let us get back to our quantum algebra $A^{\mathcal{G}}$ whose commutator is defined by $\operatorname{Tr}\left([\widehat{C}_1, \widehat{C}_2]\right) = \left[\operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{C}_1), \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{C}_2)\right]$.

We would like to be able to give a characterization of $[\widehat{C}_1, \widehat{C}_2]$ along the lines of Prop. 3, but unfortunately that used the commutativity of the product on A_0. This means that we cannot a priori hope that the commutator of quantum cycles be a quantum potential: one must a priori allow for higher-order elements.
However, one can show that the desired property holds for the cycles we're dealing with. Set $\widehat{\mathrm{IMD}} \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}}$ to be the vector space spanned by the quantum IMD cycles.

Proposition 10. *The restriction* $[,] : \widehat{\mathrm{IMD}} \wedge \widehat{\mathrm{IMD}} \longrightarrow A^{\mathcal{G}}$ *takes values into* $\widehat{\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}}$. *Moreover, the commutator* $\left[\widehat{C}_1, \widehat{C}_2\right]$ *is a quantisation of* $\{C_1, C_2\}$, *for* $\widehat{C}_1, \widehat{C}_2 \in \widehat{\mathrm{IMD}}$ *and* $C_i := \sigma(\widehat{C}_i)$.

We will discuss how to control the choice of anchoring for $\left[\widehat{C}_1, \widehat{C}_2\right]$ in the following two sections. For now, let us be content that the commutator between IMD quantum cycles is a linear combination of quantum cycles, instead of a generic polynomial of such. Moreover, the computations for those commutators are basically the same as for the Poisson bracket of classical IMD cycles.

The proof of Prop. 10 relies on a lemma, plus two separate verifications, whose proofs have been postponed to § 14.

Lemma 11. *Pick two quantum cycles* $\widehat{C}_1, \widehat{C}_2$, *with semiclassical limit* C_1, C_2. *Assume that one of* $\widehat{C}_1, \widehat{C}_2$ *is a 2-cycle, or that one of them does not contain pairs of antiparallel arrows. Then Prop. 10 holds for* $\left[\widehat{C}_1, \widehat{C}_2\right] \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}}$.

The only IMD cycles that do not satisfy the hypothesis are the degenerate 4-cycles. Hence one must still show that the commutator of two such cycles follows the same rule. This leads us to check the possible "intersections" of cycles in $\mathcal{G}$.

Definition 9.1. Two (classical or quantum) cycles are said to intersect if there exists an arrow of the first with its antiparallel in the second. The intersection is said to be nontrivial if the two cycles are different.

Notice that two classical cycles (*resp.* quantum cycles) may have a nonvanishing Poisson bracket (*resp.* vanishing commutator) only if they intersect nontrivially. Now, two

degenerate 4-cycles have only two possible nontrivial intersections: either they have the centre in common, or they do not.

Proposition 12. *Pick nodes $a, b, c, d \in I$ such that the sequences of nodes (a, b, a, c) and (a, c, d, c) define two degenerate 4-cycles. Then the following commutator vanishes:*



Here we sketched quantum cycle by drawing a black node where their anchor starts. The next intersection asks instead to show that the following picture is true:



The number at the peripheral nodes indicates the order in which one must touch them, starting from the centre (the tail of the anchor).

Anchors.

Let us decompose the classical IMD potentials W_i, W_j into a sum of classical IMD cycles: $W_i = \sum_k c_k C_k, W_j = \sum_l d_l D_l$. After expanding their vanishing Poisson bracket by bilinearity, one will find itself with a sum of potentials:

$$0 = \{W_i, W_j\} = \sum_{k,l} c_k l_l \{C_k, D_l\}.$$

Putting together all the cycles that coincide as elements of $\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}$, one will get to a finer decomposition

$$0 = \{W_i, W_j\} = \sum_m e_m E_m \in \mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}.$$

Now, since we're assuming that $E_m \neq E_{m'}$ for $m \neq m'$ in this sum, one has necessarily $e_m = 0$ for all m: any finite family of distinct cycles in $\mathcal{G}$ is free inside $\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}$, by definition.

Now, thanks to Prop. 10, one will find a similar development:

$$\big[\widehat{W}_i, \widehat{W}_j\big] = \sum_{k,l} c_{kl} \big[\widehat{C}_k, \widehat{D}_l\big],$$

with $\widehat{C}_k, \widehat{D}$ being the quantisation of C_k, D_l. Moreover, $\left[\widehat{C}_k, \widehat{D}_l\right]$ is a quantisation of $\{C_k, D_l\}$. One would now hope to have

$$\left[\widehat{W}_i, \widehat{W}_j\right] = \sum_m e_m \widehat{E}_m \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}},$$

with the same constants $e_m \in \mathbb{C}$, for some lift $\widehat{E}_m$ of E_m. This happens if and only if every time that one has $\{C_k, D_l\} = \{C_{k'}, D_{l'}\}$ in $\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}$, then one also has $\left[\widehat{C}_k, \widehat{D}_l\right] = \left[\widehat{C}_{k'}, \widehat{D}_{l'}\right]$ in $\widehat{\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}}$. Since those two commutators have the same underlying classical cycle, this happens if and only if their anchors are equivalent. The obstruction for this to happen is that above a given intersection of classical IMD cycles there are several nonequivalent intersections of quantum IMD cycles: the anchor breaks some symmetry, *a priori*. The final part of the proof of Thm. 8 consists in showing that this does not happen.

First, a direct verification based on elementary combinatoric arguments shows the following.

Proposition 13. *There exist exactly 15 distinct nontrivial intersections of classical IMD cycles. Among them, 13 give a nonvanishing Poisson bracket, and 5 of those are sums of cycles without pairs of antiparallel arrows.*

To prove this proposition, the position of the anchor of all 2-cycles is immaterial. Indeed, thanks to Prop. 7, moving the anchor amounts to add a constant, which lies in the centre of A. Now, all the cases where one has no pairs of antiparallel arrows give no issues: any two quantisations of a cycle without such pairs are equivalent. One must thus consider the remaining 8 "troublesome" intersections, and see that no symmetry can be broken by adding an anchor to the cycles involved. Those intersections can be described as follows, in plain words:

(1) two opposite 3-cycles
(2) a 3-cycle and a degenerate 4-cycle with one pair of antiparallel arrows in common
(3) a 3-cycle and a nondegenerate 4-cycle with two pairs of antiparallel arrows in common
(4) two nondegenerate 4-cycles with the centre in common
(5) a nondegenerate 4-cycle and a degenerate one, with one pair of antiparallel arrows in common
(6) same as the one just above, with two pairs in common
(7) two nondegenerate 4-cycles with two pairs of antiparallel arrows in common
(8) two opposite nondegenerate 4-cycles

One can finally discuss those separately. All these intersections give cycles which are classically distinguishable, apart from the pairs (2,3) and (5,7). Also, n°4 has already been dealt with above.

9.1. **Last verifications.**

Here we argue that the aforementioned nontrivial intersections 1 – 8 yield equivalent quantum potentials, as needed in order to conclude the proof of Thm. 8. We will thus sketch a few commutators of quantum cycles. The logic behind the pictures is always to summarise longer computations in (noncommutative) variables, exploiting Prop. 10. Notice however that the explicit computations appear in the appendix § 14, where a

harmless choice of Darboux coordinates is made in order to simplify the constants that come out of the commutators.

First, n°1 and n°8 are settled by a uniqueness argument: in both cases, two such pairs appears exactly twice in the commutator $\left[\widehat{W}_i, \widehat{W}_j\right]$, and with reversed orders. This just gives a sign, and the vanishing of the associated weights follows from Thm. 1: if this did not happen, then the classical IMD system would not be flat.

Next, let us move to n°2 and n°3. One can verify that those nontrivial intersections produce 5-cycles built from glueing a 2-cycle to a 3-cycle, the two having no antiparallel arrows in common. It would then be enough to choose anchors so that one always follows the 3-cycle first, and this can indeed be done.

Proposition 14. *Pick nodes $a, b, c, d \in I$ so that (a, d, c) defines a 3-cycle. Assume also that a and b are adjacent. Then one may choose Darboux coordinates so that:*



Proposition 15. *Pick nodes $a, b, c, d \in I$ defining a 4-cycle. Assume that a and c are adjacent. Then one may choose Darboux coordinates so that:*



Now, every time that such a nontrivial intersection arises, one can base the 3-cycle as in the above figure without loss of generality, and the resulting 5-cycle will start at its 3-subcycle. In particular, two such commutators will equal if and only if their associated classical brackets are, which is the result one is after.

Next, one should consider n°6.

Proposition 16. *Pick nodes $a, b, c, d \in I$ defining a 4-cycle. One may choose Darboux coordinates so that:*



On the right-hand side one has split the nodes $c = c_1 = c_2$ and $b = b_1 = b_2$, so to indicate the order in which they're touched. The point of this proposition is the same as before: up to changing the anchor of the nondegenerate 4-cycle, all 6-cycles that appear as a result of this type of nontrivial intersection will have equivalent anchors (one follows the 2-cycle first).

Finally, one should check n°5 and n°7. Those two nontrivial intersections produce 6-cycles built from glueing a nondegenerate 4-cycle and a 2-cycle, the two having no antiparallel arrows in common. It would then be enough to choose anchors so that one always follows the 4-cycle first, and this can indeed be done.

Proposition 17. *Pick nodes $a, b, c, d, e \in I$ such that (a, b, c, d) defines a 4-cycle. Assume that b and e are adjacent. Then one can choose Darboux coordinates so that:*



Proposition 18. *Pick nodes $a, b, c, d, e \in I$ so that (a, b, c, d) and (a, b, c, e) define 4-cycles. One can choose Darboux coordinates so that:*



This concludes the proof of Thm. 8.

10. KZ vs the star

Here we show that the KZ connection is a reduction of the simply-laced quantum connection for the degenerate reading of a star with no irregular times. Recall that a star

is a complete bipartite graph having one part with a single node. The statements we will prove are the following.

Theorem 19. *The Schlesinger connection quantises to the KZ connection via the standard PBW isomorphism.*

This is proven in § 10.3.

Theorem 20. *The SLIMS reduce to the Schlesinger system, in the special case of the degenerate reading of a star with no irregular times.*

This is proven in § 10.4 and § 10.5.

Theorem 21. *The SLQC, reduces to the KZ system, in the same case as above.*

This is proven in § 10.6 and § 10.7.

10.1. **Simply-laced quantum connection of a star.**

The general construction of § 3 must be reduced to the following data: the set J has cardinality $k = 2$ the reading is $a(J) = \{+\infty, 0\}$, and $T^0 = 0$. One considers the complete graph on nodes J. The splayed graph $\mathcal{G}$ will be a star on nodes $I = I^0 \coprod I^\infty = \{0\} \coprod I^\infty$. It will be centred at 0, and have $m := |I^\infty|$ legs.
The base space of times is then $\mathbf{B} = \mathbb{C}^m \setminus \{\text{diags}\}$, the vector phase-space is

$$\mathbb{M} = \mathrm{Hom}(W^\infty, W^0) \oplus \mathrm{Hom}(W^0, W^\infty),$$

equipped with the symplectic form $\omega_a = \mathrm{Tr}(dQ \wedge dP)$, where one considers linear maps $Q : W^\infty \longrightarrow W^0, P : W^0 \longrightarrow W^\infty$. If $W^\infty = \bigoplus_{i \in I^\infty} V_i$, then one will write Q_i for the component of Q in $V_i^* \otimes W^0$, and P_i for the component of P in $(W^0)^* \otimes V_i$. Notice that we've basically chosen an orientation of $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$, which wasn't necessary. However, this provides Darboux coordinates:

$$\{(Q_i)_{kl}, (P_j)_{mn}\} = \delta_{ij}\delta_{kn}\delta_{lm}, \qquad \{(Q_i)_{kl}, (Q_j)_{mn}\} = 0 = \{(P_i)_{kl}, (P_j)_{mn}\}.$$

Those data code a space of meromorphic connections of the form

$$\nabla = d - \sum_{i \in I^\infty} \frac{Q_i P_i}{z - t_i} dz,$$

on the trivial vector bundle $W^0 \times \mathbb{C}P^1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}P^1$. Here $\{t_i\}_{i \in I^\infty} \in \mathbf{B}$, and $(Q, P) \in \mathbb{M}$.

The isomonodromic deformations of those connections are coded by the Hamiltonian system

$$\varpi = \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\widetilde{PQ} PQ\right) = \sum_{i \in I^\infty} H_i dt_i \in \Omega^0(\mathbb{F}_a, \pi^* T^* \mathbf{B}),$$

where $\pi : \mathbb{F}_a = \mathbb{M} \times \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$ is the trivial symplectic fibration of § 3. This system spells out as

$$H_i(Q, P, T^\infty) = \sum_{i \neq j \in I^\infty} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(P_i Q_j P_j Q_i)}{t_i - t_j} \in \mathrm{Sym}(\mathbb{M}^*). \tag{4}$$

Indeed, H_i is the sum of the traces of all (necessarily degenerate) 4-cycles at the node i, whereas 3-cycles cannot appear in a bipartite context, and all 2-cycles are not there because of $A = T^0 = dT^0 = 0$.

The SLQC at hand is then

$$\widehat{\nabla} = d_{\mathbf{B}} - \widehat{\varpi} = d_{\mathbf{B}} - \sum_{i\in I^\infty}\left(\sum_{i\neq j\in I^\infty}\frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_j\widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_i)}{t_i-t_j}\right)dt_i. \tag{5}$$

This is a connection on the trivial (quantum) vector bundle $\mathbb{E}_a = A\times\mathbf{B}\longrightarrow\mathbf{B}$, where $A := W(\mathbb{M}^*,\omega_a)$. Here again one denotes by ω_a the symplectic form induced on $\mathbb{M}^*$ by the linear isomorphism induced by the symplectic pairing $\mathbb{M}\wedge\mathbb{M}\longrightarrow\mathbb{C}$. As explained in § 5.1, this bilinear alternating map $\mathbb{M}^*\wedge\mathbb{M}^*\longrightarrow\mathbb{C}$ is the restriction of the Poisson bracket of $\mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})$ to linear function.

The main theorem 8 assures that $\widehat{\nabla}$ is strongly flat. Let us set

$$\widehat{H}_i := \sum_{i\neq j}\frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_j\widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_i)}{t_i-t_j},$$

for the quantum Hamiltonians defining the simply-laced quantum connection. Let us prove explicitly that the connection is strongly flat. To this end, the only nontrivial verification is that for the commutators.

Proposition 22. *One has*

$$\left[\widehat{H}_i,\widehat{H}_j\right] = 0$$

for all $i,j\in I^\infty$.

Proof. Pick $i\neq j\in I^\infty$. The trick is to decompose the commutator in the following sum:

$$\begin{aligned}\left[\widehat{H}_i,\widehat{H}_j\right] = &\sum_{k\in I^\infty\setminus\{i,j\}}\frac{1}{(t_i-t_k)(t_j-t_k)}\Big[\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_k\widehat{P}_k\widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_i),\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_k\widehat{P}_k\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_j)\Big]+\\ &+\frac{1}{(t_i-t_j)(t_j-t_k)}\Big[\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_j\widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_i),\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_j\widehat{Q}_k\widehat{P}_k)\Big]+\\ &+\frac{1}{(t_i-t_k)(t_j-t_i)}\Big[\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_i\widehat{Q}_k\widehat{P}_k),\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_i\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_j)\Big]\end{aligned}$$

This decomposition is suggested by looking at the degenerate 4-cycles at the nodes i,j with 2-cycles in common, which leaves the following nontrivial intersections:



and



and



All those cycles are based at the centre $0 \in I$ of the star. Those intersections give precisely the terms above. Now, using Prop. 14 for the commutators, one finds:

$$[\widehat{H}_i, \widehat{H}_j] = \sum_{k\neq i,j} \frac{1}{(t_i - t_k)(t_j - t_k)} \operatorname{Tr}\left([\widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{Q}_k\widehat{P}_k]\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_j\right) +$$
$$+ \frac{1}{(t_i - t_j)(t_j - t_k)} \operatorname{Tr}\left([\widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_j]\widehat{Q}_k\widehat{P}_k\right) + \frac{1}{(t_i - t_k)(t_j - t_i)} \operatorname{Tr}\left([\widehat{Q}_k\widehat{P}_k, \widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_i]\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_j\right) =$$
$$= \sum_{k\neq i,j} \left[\frac{1}{(t_i - t_k)(t_j - t_k)} - \frac{1}{(t_i - t_j)(t_j - t_k)} - \frac{1}{(t_i - t_k)(t_j - t_i)}\right] \operatorname{Tr}\left([\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_j, \widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_i]\widehat{Q}_k\widehat{P}_k\right).$$

Finally, this vanishes thanks to the identity

$$\frac{1}{(t_i - t_k)(t_j - t_k)} - \frac{1}{(t_i - t_j)(t_j - t_k)} - \frac{1}{(t_i - t_k)(t_j - t_i)} = 0.$$

□

It is precisely this type of computation that motivated the introduction of (traces of) quantum potentials. Moreover, cyclic identities of the type above for the functions $(t_i - t_k)^{-1}(t_j - t_k)^{-1}$ are also used in the proof of flatness of the KZ connection. Indeed, we view the commutation relations among degenerate 4-cycles as a lift of the so-called Kohno relations for the operators Ω_{ij} of the following section.

10.2. **The KZ connection.**

Here we briefly recall the algebraic definition of the KZ connection [KZ84]. Pick an integer $m > 0$, and consider the space $\mathbf{B} = \mathrm{Conf}_m(\mathbb{C})$ of configuration of m-tuples of points on $\mathbb{C}$, which is precisely the same base space as above. Set also $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{gl}_{\mathbb{C}}(W^0)$,

where W^0 is a finite-dimensional complex vector space. The (universal) KZ connection is a connection $\widehat{\nabla}_{\mathrm{KZ}}$ in the trivial vector bundle

$$\mathbb{E} = U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m} \times \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}.$$

It can be written

$$\widehat{\nabla}_{\mathrm{KZ}} = d_{\mathbf{B}} - \sum_{1\leq i\leq m} \left(\sum_{i\neq j} \frac{\Omega_{ij}}{t_i - t_j} \right) dt_i, \tag{6}$$

for certain operators $\Omega_{ij} : U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m} \longrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}$. To define them, one considers the standard invariant $\mathbb{C}$-bilinear form

$$\mathrm{Tr} : \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}, \qquad \mathrm{Tr} : (A, B) \longmapsto \mathrm{Tr}(AB),$$

which provides an isomorphism $\mathrm{Tr} : \mathfrak{g}^* \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}$, as it is nondegenerate. Next, one considers the identity $\mathrm{Id}_{\mathfrak{g}} \in \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g}^*$, and uses the trace on the second factor to turn it into an element $\widetilde{\Omega} \in \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g}$. Now one sets $\Omega := \pi\big(\widetilde{\Omega}\big) \in U(\mathfrak{g})_{\leq 2}$, using the canonical filtration-preserving projection $\pi : \mathrm{Tens}(\mathfrak{g}) \longrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})$.[2] Finally, if $i \neq j$, one defines Ω_{ij} as the left multiplication of Ω on the ith and jth factors of $U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}$, and the identity elsewhere.[3] Finally, let us set

$$\widehat{H}_i^{\mathrm{KZ}} := \sum_{j\neq i} \frac{\Omega_{ij}}{t_i - t_j}, \tag{7}$$

for further use. Those are the KZ Hamiltonians.

Schlesinger system.

Another important ingredient is the fact that KZ can be realised as a quantisation of the Schlesinger system ([Res92]). This is the nonlinear system of first order PDEs controlling the isomonodromic deformations of Fuchsian systems on $\mathbb{C}P^1$. Fixing again a finite-dimensional vector space W^0, these systems can be written

$$\partial_z \psi = \sum_{1\leq i\leq m} \frac{R_i}{z - t_i} \psi,$$

for a local smooth section ψ of the trivial vector bundle $W^0 \times \mathbb{C}P^1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}P^1$. Here z is a local holomorphic coordinate that identifies $\mathbb{C}P^1 = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. Such systems are given by pole positions $t_i \in \mathbb{C}$ and residues $R_i \in \mathrm{End}(W^0)$. The isomonodromy problem consists in looking for modification of the residues R_i, as functions of the positions t_i, such that the monodromy of the meromorphic equations around the poles stays fixed. The solution to this problem amounts to solving the following system of differential equations, the Schlesinger system:

$$dR_i = -\sum_{i\neq j} \frac{\big[R_i, R_j\big]}{t_i - t_j} d(t_i - t_j).$$

[2] This is just the abstract construction of the Casimir element $\Omega \in Z\big(U(\mathfrak{g})\big)$ of $\mathfrak{g}$, with respect to the nondegenerate bilinear form Tr.

[3] Notice that one usually adds a complex parameter in front of the 1-form

$$\widehat{\varpi}_{\mathrm{KZ}} := \sum_{i\neq j} \Omega_{ij} d\log(t_i - t_j) \in \Omega^1\Big(\mathbf{B}, \mathrm{End}\left(U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}\right)\Big).$$

This however doesn't affect the strong flatness of the KZ connection: every connection of the form $\widehat{\nabla}^{\hbar}_{\mathrm{KZ}} = d_{\mathbf{B}} - \hbar\widehat{\varpi}_{\mathrm{KZ}}$ would be strongly flat as well, for every complex parameter $\hbar \in \mathbb{C}$. Using the construction recalled in § 5.2 one could add the quantum parameter in the SLQC too.

If one sets $G := \mathrm{GL}_{\mathbb{C}}(W^0), \mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{gl}_{\mathbb{C}}(W^0)$, then this is a system of equations for local sections of the trivial Poisson fibration

$$\mathbb{F} := \mathfrak{g}^m \times \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B},$$

where $\mathbf{B} = \mathbb{C}^m \setminus \{\text{diags}\}$ parametrises the choices of pole positions. Geometrically, this amounts to a Ehresmann connection on the fibration. It can now be shown that (8) admits an Hamiltonian formulation, meaning that there exist smooth functions $H_i^{\mathrm{Sch}} : \mathbb{F} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\frac{\partial R_j}{\partial t_i} = \{H_i^{\mathrm{Sch}}, R_j\},$$

for $1 \leq i, j \leq m$. The Poisson bracket is the standard linear one on $\mathfrak{g}^m \cong (\mathfrak{g}^*)^m$. These Hamiltonians are called the Schlesinger Hamiltonians, and they explicitly given by the formula

$$H_i^{\mathrm{Sch}} = H_i(R, T) = \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(R_i R_j)}{t_i - t_j} \in \mathrm{Sym}\left((\mathfrak{g}^m)^*\right). \tag{8}$$

It is no coincidence that there are many similarities between this system and the simply-laced isomonodromy system (4) for the star. In fact, the former can be obtained from the latter via a simple reduction, as shown in [Boa12]. Before delving into that, let us show why KZ is a quantisation of Schlesinger.

10.3. **KZ is a quantisation of Schlesinger.**

There is a standard quantisation machinery for a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. The PBW theorem assures that one has an isomorphism of vector spaces

$$\mathcal{Q} : \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g}) \longrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g}),$$

defined on monomials by symmetrisation:

$$\mathcal{Q} : x_1 \dots x_n \longmapsto \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_n} \widehat{x}_{\sigma_1} \dots \widehat{x}_{\sigma_n}. \tag{9}$$

Here $\widehat{x} \in U(\mathfrak{g})$ denotes the image of $x \in \mathfrak{g} \subseteq \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g})$ under the composition

$$\mathfrak{g} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Tens}(\mathfrak{g}) \twoheadrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g}),$$

and Σ_n is the symmetric group on n objects. The point of course is that the product in the universal algebra is noncommutative, thereby deforming the commutative one that is defined on the symmetric algebra. The semiclassical limit $\sigma : U(\mathfrak{g}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g})$ is given by the grading map, since $\mathrm{gr}\left(U(\mathfrak{g})\right) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g})$. This filtered quantisation is the Poisson analogue of the symplectic construction of the Weyl algebra of § 5.1. Notice also that there exist canonical isomorphisms $U(\mathfrak{g}^m) \cong U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}$ and $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g})^m \cong \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}$ for all $m \geq 1$, and that there is a unique natural way to extend the quantisation to an isomorphism $\mathcal{Q} : \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m} \longrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}$. One can apply this construction *verbatim* to $\mathfrak{g}^m = \left(\mathfrak{gl}_{\mathbb{C}}(W^0)\right)^m$, getting a quantisation map $\mathcal{Q}$ as above. This will be referred to as the PBW quantisation, in the rest of the article.

Now, the Schlesinger Hamiltonians are smooth sections

$$H_i^{\mathrm{Sch}} : \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g}^*)^{\otimes m},$$

since to every point $\{t_i\}_i \in \mathbf{B}$ in the base they associate a polynomial function on the fibre $\mathfrak{g}^m$ of $\mathbb{F}$. Thanks to the trace-isomorphism $\mathfrak{g}^* \cong \mathfrak{g}$, one may as consider them as

elements of $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}$, abusively written H_i^{Sch} as well. Now it makes sense to compare the fibrewise quantisation $\mathcal{Q}(H_i^{\mathrm{Sch}}) \in U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}$ with the KZ Hamiltonian (7).

Proposition 23. *One has* $\mathcal{Q}\big(\mathrm{Tr}(R_iR_j)\big) = \Omega_{ij}$ *for all* $i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.

Proof. It is helpful to fix the canonical $\mathbb{C}$-basis $\{e_{ij}\}_{i,j}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ consisting of the square matrices such that $(e_{ij})_{kl} = \delta_{ik}\delta_{jl}$. The formula $\mathrm{Tr}(AB) = \sum_{i,j} A_{ij}B_{ji}$ means precisely that

$$\mathrm{Tr} = \sum_{i,j} de_{ij} \otimes de_{ji} \in \mathfrak{g}^* \otimes \mathfrak{g}^*,$$

where $de_{ij} \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ is the dual vector to e_{ij}. Now, the trace-isomorphism $\mathrm{Tr} : \mathfrak{g}^* \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ in the chosen bases reads $\mathrm{Tr} : de_{ij} \longmapsto e_{ji}$, since indeed

$$de_{ij}(e_{kl}) = \delta_{ik}\delta_{jl} = \mathrm{Tr}(e_{ji}e_{kl}).$$

Now one should introduce some notation for the factors of the product $\mathfrak{g}^m$ on which the Hamiltonian H_i^{Sch} acts nontrivially. We borrow the superscript notation $de_{kl}^{(i)} : \mathfrak{g}^m \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ from [FMTV00], to denote the function that acts as de_{kl} on the ith factor (and that does not depend on the other variables). Then one has:

$$\mathrm{Tr}(R_iR_j) = \sum_{k,l} (R_i)_{kl}(R_j)_{lk} = \sum_{k,l} de_{kl}^{(i)} \otimes de_{lk}^{(j)}(R),$$

where $R = (R_1, \dots, R_m) \in \mathfrak{g}^m$. The trace-dual of this element is $\sum_{k,l} e_{lk}^{(j)} \otimes e_{kl}^{(i)}$, and one computes:

$$\mathcal{Q}\left(\sum_{k,l} e_{lk}^{(j)} \otimes e_{kl}^{(i)}\right) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k,l} \widehat{e}_{kl}^{(j)} \cdot \widehat{e}_{kl}^{(i)} + \widehat{e}_{kl}^{(i)} \cdot \widehat{e}_{lk}^{(j)} = \sum_{k,l} \widehat{e}_{kl}^{(i)} \cdot \widehat{e}_{lk}^{(j)}.$$

The last passage is due to the fact that the actions on two different factors commute, hence $\big[\widehat{e}_{kl}^{(i)}, \widehat{e}_{lk}^{(j)}\big] = 0$ as elements of $U(\mathfrak{g}^m)$.

What is left to do is check that $\Omega_{ij} = \sum_{k,l} \widehat{e}_{kl}^{(i)} \cdot \widehat{e}_{lk}^{(j)}$ for this choice of basis. But indeed, the identity $\mathrm{Id}_{\mathfrak{g}} \in \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g}^*$ is written $\mathrm{Id}_{\mathfrak{g}} = \sum_{i,j} e_{ij} \otimes de_{ij}$, so that one has

$$\widetilde{\Omega} = \sum_{i,j} e_{ij} \otimes e_{ji} \subseteq \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g},$$

with the notation of § 10.2. Now the Casimir element is the canonical projection to the universal enveloping algebra:

$$\Omega = \pi(\widetilde{\Omega}) = \sum_{i,j} \widehat{e}_{ij} \cdot \widehat{e}_{ji} \in U(\mathfrak{g})_{\leq 2}.$$

The action of Ω on the ith and jth factor of $U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}$ by left multiplication then reads

$$\Omega_{ij} = \sum_{k,l} \widehat{e}_{kl}^{(i)} \cdot \widehat{e}_{lk}^{(j)},$$

as it was to be shown. □

This proposition implies as corollary that $\mathcal{Q}(H_i^{\mathrm{Sch}}) = \widehat{H}_i^{\mathrm{KZ}}$, by linearity:

$$\mathcal{Q}(H_i^{\mathrm{Sch}}) = \mathcal{Q}\left(\sum_{j\neq i} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(R_iR_j)}{t_i - t_j}\right) = \sum_{j\neq i} \frac{\mathcal{Q}\big(\mathrm{Tr}(R_iR_j)\big)}{t_i - t_j} = \sum_{j\neq i} \frac{\Omega_{ij}}{t_i - t_j} = \widehat{H}_i^{\mathrm{KZ}}.$$

It is in this sense that we say that the KZ connection is a quantisation of the Schlesinger system.[4]

10.4. **The classical reduction.**

The main idea is to replace the product $Q_iP_i \in \mathrm{End}(W^0)$ that appears in (4) with the residue $R_i \in \mathrm{End}(W^0)$ that appears in (8). This transforms the former into the latter, as one sees directly on the explicit formulae.

To make this rigorous, get back to the vector spaces $W^0, W^\infty = \bigoplus_{i\in I^\infty} V_i$, and set $\mathfrak{g}^0 := \mathfrak{gl}(W^0)$. Thanks to the trace-pairing, one has a canonical identification

$$L_i := W^0 \otimes V_i^* = \mathrm{Hom}(V_i, W^0) \cong \mathrm{Hom}(W^0, V_i) = (W^0)^* \otimes V_i,$$

and this for all $i \in I^\infty$. One now considers the map given by the composition of linear functions, that is

$$\mu_i : L_i \oplus L_i^* \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^0, \qquad (A, B) \longmapsto AB,$$

This best expressed by choosing bases. If $\{e_j\}_j$ is a basis of W^0, then one has a canonical basis of $\mathfrak{g}^0$, provided by $\{e_{jk} := e_j \otimes de_k\}_{jk}$: e_{jk} is the endomorphism that maps e_k into e_j. If one next chooses a basis $\{f_j^{(i)}\}_j$ of V_i, then one has a basis $\{(ef^{(i)})_{jk} := e_j \otimes df_k^{(i)}\}_{jk}$ of L_i: $(ef^{(i)})_{jk}$ is the linear function that maps $f_k^{(i)}$ into e_j. The trace-duality sends this to a basis $\{(f^{(i)}e)_{jk} := f_j^{(i)} \otimes de_k\}_{jk}$ of L_i^*, with $(f^{(i)}e)_{jk} : W^0 \longrightarrow V_i$ sending e_k to $f_j^{(i)}$. With those choices made, the product $\mu_i : T^*L_i \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^0$ reads

$$\mu_i((ef^{(i)})_{jk}, (f^{(i)}e)_{lm}) = \mu_i\big((e_j \otimes df_k^{(i)}) \oplus (f_l^{(i)} \otimes de_m)\big) = \delta_{kl} e_j \otimes de_m = \delta_{kl} e_{jm}.$$

Then one expands by bilinearity, to get the usual matrix product $L_i \otimes L_i^* \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^0$. Notice that μ_i is nothing but a restriction of the moment map for the standard action of $\mathrm{GL}(W^0)$ on $\mathbb{M}$. Equivalently, it is the Poisson map for the restricted action of $\mathrm{GL}(W^0)$ on the invariant syplectic subspace $T^*L_i \subseteq \mathbb{M}$:

$$g.(Q_j, P_j)_{j\in I^\infty} = (Q'_j, P'_j)_{j\in I^\infty},$$

with

$$(Q'_j, P'_j) = \begin{cases} (Q_j, P_j), & j \neq i, \\ (gQ_i, P_ig^{-1}), & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

In particular, μ_i is a smooth Poisson map.

This was the situation for a single leg of the star-shaped graph $\mathcal{G}$. One can now glue the maps μ_i to the full moment map

$$\mu : \mathbb{M} = \bigoplus_{i\in I^\infty} T^*L_i \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^0, \qquad \mu : (Q_i, P_i)_{i\in I^\infty} \longmapsto \sum_{i\in I^\infty} \mu_i(Q, P) = \sum_{i\in I^\infty} Q_iP_i,$$

which will satisfy the same as above. We shall also abusively denote $\mu : \mathbb{M} \longrightarrow (\mathfrak{g}^0)^m$ the map $(Q_i, P_i)_{i\in I^\infty} \longmapsto (Q_iP_i)_{i\in I^\infty}$ that separates the components.

Proposition 24. *One has $\mu^*(H_i^{\mathrm{Sch}}) = H_i$ for all $i \in I^\infty$.*

[4]Notice that we chose to transport H_i^{Sch} to $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}$ via the duality defined by the trace pairing, and then to apply $\mathcal{Q}$. It would have been the same to transport the Lie bracket of $\mathfrak{g}$ to a Lie bracket on $\mathfrak{g}^*$, still via the trace, and then to consider the quantisation of the Schlesinger Hamiltonian as an element of $U(\mathfrak{g}^*)^{\otimes m}$. Next, one can show that this elements corresponds to Ω via the obvious lift of $\mathrm{Tr} : \mathfrak{g}^* \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ to a morphism $\mathrm{Tr} : U(\mathfrak{g}^*)^{\otimes m} \longrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}$. This is tautological, since the bracket of $\mathfrak{g}^*$ is by definition the one that makes $\mathrm{Tr} : \mathfrak{g}^* \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ an isomorphism of Lie algebras.

Proof. By linearity, it is enough to check that

$$\mu^* \operatorname{Tr}(R_i R_j) = \operatorname{Tr}(Q_i P_i Q_j P_j),$$

for $i \neq j$. This follows from the fact that

$$(R_i)_{kl} = de_{kl}(R_i), \qquad (Q_i)_{kl} = d(ef^{(i)})_{kl}(Q_i), \qquad (P_i)_{kl} = d(f^{(i)}e)_{kl}(P_i),$$

with the same notation as above, by the very definition of the component maps with respect to the bases $\{e_j\}_j$ of W^0 and $\{f_j^{(i)}\}_j$ of V_i. Notice that the coordinate function $R \longmapsto (R_i)_{kl} = de_{kl}(R_i)$ can also be written $de_{kl}^{(i)}$, as in § 10.3. Having understood this notation, one has

$$\mu_i^* de_{jk}^{(i)}\big((ef^{(i)})_{lm} \oplus (f^{(i)}e)_{no}\big) = de_{jk}^{(i)}\mu_i\big((ef^{(i)})_{lm} \oplus (f^{(i)}e)_{no}\big) = de_{jk}^{(i)}(\delta_{mn}e_{lo}^{(i)}) = \delta_{mn}\delta_{jl}\delta_{ko},$$

which yields the formula

$$\mu_i^* de_{jk}^{(i)} = \sum_m d(ef^{(i)})_{jm} \otimes d(f^{(i)}e)_{mk} \in \mathscr{O}(T^*L_i).$$

Hence the following computation yields the result:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu^* \operatorname{Tr}(R_i R_j) = \mu^* \sum_{k,l} (R_i)_{kl}(R_j)_{lk} = \sum_{k,l} \big(\mu_i^*(R_i)_{kl}\big)\big(\mu_j^*(R_j)_{lk}\big) = \\
&= \sum_{k,l} \big(\mu_i^* de_{kl}^{(i)}\big) \otimes \big(\mu_j^* de_{lk}^{(j)}\big) = \sum_{k,l,m,n} d(ef^{(i)})_{km} \otimes d(f^{(i)}e)_{ml} \otimes d(ef^{(j)})_{ln} \otimes d(f^{(j)}e)_{nk} = \\
&= \sum_{k,l,m,n} (Q_i)_{km}(P_i)_{ml}(Q_j)_{ln}(P_j)_{nk} = \operatorname{Tr}(Q_i P_i Q_j P_j).
\end{aligned}$$

□

This proposition means that there is a consistent way to pass from the star-shaped SLIMS to the Schlesinger ones, by the change of variable $R_i := Q_i P_i$. We view this as a classical reduction, in the following sense.

10.5. **Dual symplectic pairs and classical Hamiltonian reduction.**

Consider two smooth affine complex Poisson varieties P_1, P_2.

Definition 10.1. A smooth affine symplectic variety (M, ω) over $\mathbb{C}$, together with a couple of Poisson maps $\mu_1, \mu_2 : M \longrightarrow P_i$, is called a symplectic dual pair if one has

$$\{\mu_1^*(\mathscr{O}(P_1)), \mu_2^*(\mathscr{O}(P_2))\}_\omega = 0,$$

where $\mathscr{O}(P_i)$ are the global sections of the structural sheaf of P_i, and with $\{\cdot,\cdot\}_\omega$ being the Poisson bracket on $\mathscr{O}(M)$ defined by ω.

This notion was introduced in [Kar89].[5] Such a situation arises in particular for the moment maps with respect to commuting Hamiltonian actions. To prove this, pick two complex algebraic groups G_1, G_2 with Lie algebras $\mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_2$, and a symplectic manifold (M, ω).

Lemma 25. *Assume that G_1, G_2 act on (M, ω) with momenta $\mu_i : M \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}_i^*$. If the two actions commute, then one has a dual symplectic pair.*

[5]This is the weakest possible notion that one finds in the literature. Some authors require the maps μ_i to be submersive. Some other require that the two subalgebras $\mu_i^*(\mathscr{O}(P_i))$ be the mutual centraliser of one another into $\mathscr{O}(M)$.

Proof. One can consider the natural action of $G := G_1 \times G_2$ on (M, ω). It admits the moment

$$\mu = \mu_1 \oplus \mu_2 : M \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2 \,.$$

Now one has, for $x_i \in \mathfrak{g}_i$:

$$\begin{aligned}\{\mu_1^*(x_1), \mu_2^*(x_2)\}_\omega = \{\mu^*(x_1, 0), \mu^*(0, x_2)\}_\omega = \mu^*\big([(x_1, 0), (0, x_2)]\big) = \\ = \mu^*\big([x_1, 0], [0, x_2]\big) = \mu^*(0, 0) = 0,\end{aligned}$$

where one used the fact that $\mu^* : \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2 \longrightarrow \mathscr{O}(M)$ is a morphism of Lie algebras, plus the definition of the direct sum of Lie algebras. □

To apply this to the case at hand, set $G^0 := \mathrm{GL}(W^0), G^\infty := \prod_{i \in I^\infty} \mathrm{GL}(V_i)$, with Lie algebras $\mathfrak{g}^0, \mathfrak{g}^\infty$. The two groups act on $(\mathbb{M}, \omega_a)$ with commutative Hamitonian actions. Introduce the notation $\mu_0 : \mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^0 \cong (\mathfrak{g}^0)^*$ and $\mu_\infty : \mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^\infty \cong (\mathfrak{g}^\infty)^*$ for the momenta. One would now like to relate the subalgebra $\mu_0^*(\mathscr{O}(\mathfrak{g}^0)) \subseteq \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})$ to that of regular functions on the reduction $\mathbb{M}/G^\infty$. Recall that this is by definition the affine Poisson scheme defined as

$$\mathbb{M}/G^\infty := \mathrm{Spec}\left(\mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})^{G^\infty}\right),$$

using elementary affine GIT theory. This is well defined, because one is acting via a reductive group on affine space, but it can have geometric issues: the space may be nonreduced and/or singular. Here we are however only interested in the dual functional viewpoint, i.e. the algebraic one, which is more suited to deformation quantisation.

Let us then briefly recall how to define the (classical) algebraic reduction $R(\mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M}), \mathfrak{g}^\infty, I)$ of $\mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})$ with respect to the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}^\infty$ and an ideal $I \subseteq \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g}^\infty)$, assuming there to be a (co)moment $\mu_\infty^* : \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g}^\infty) \longrightarrow \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})$. Namely, one considers the ideal $J \subseteq \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})$ generated by $\mu_\infty^*(I)$, and then one sets

$$R(\mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M}), \mathfrak{g}^\infty, I) := \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty}/J^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty},$$

where

$$\mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty} := \{f \in \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M}) \mid \{\mu_\infty^*(\mathfrak{g}^\infty), f\} = 0\},$$

and $J^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty} = J \cap \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty}$. Notice that

$$\mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty} = \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})^{G^\infty} := \{f \in \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M}) \mid (G^\infty)^* f = f\},$$

by taking the derivative of the G^∞-action.

Lemma 26. *One has* $\{\mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty}, J\} \subseteq J$.

Proof. Pick $c \in \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty}, b \in J$. One may write $b = \sum_i b_i \mu_\infty^*(a_i)$ for suitable $b_i \in \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M}), a_i \in I$. Then:

$$\{c, b\} = \sum_i \{c, b_i \mu_\infty^*(a_i)\} = \sum_i b_i \{c, \mu_\infty^*(a_i)\} + \mu_\infty^*(a_i)\{c, b_i\} = \sum_i \mu_\infty^*(a_i)\{c, b_i\} \in J,$$

since $\{\mu_\infty^*(a_i), c\} = 0$ by $\mathfrak{g}^\infty$-invariance. □

This implies that the invariant part $J^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty}$ is a Poisson ideal in $\mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty}$, and thus the quotient is Poisson. Notice that one has

$$\mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty}/J^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty} \cong \Big(\mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})/J\Big)^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty},$$

since $\mathfrak{g}^\infty$ is reductive. The geometric counterpart to all that would be to fix a closed G^∞-invariant set $\mathcal{O} \subseteq (\mathfrak{g}^\infty)^*$ (e.g. the Zariski-closure of a coadjoint orbit) and then to consider its associated ideal of vanishing functions

$$I := \{f \in \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g}^\infty) \mid f|_{\mathcal{O}} = 0\} \subseteq \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g}^\infty).$$

Then one knows that the quotient $\mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})/J$ corresponds to the space of regular functions on the preimage $\mu_\infty^{-1}(\mathcal{O}) \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. Finally, the G^∞-invariant part provides the functions on

$$\mu_\infty^{-1}(\mathcal{O})/G^\infty =: \mathbb{M}//_{\mathcal{O}}G^\infty,$$

which is the usual Marsden-Weinstein (classical) Hamiltonian reduction. This is just a symplectic leaf of the above quotient $\mathbb{M}/G^\infty$.

Now, the important feature of the above symplectic dual pairs is that the image of μ_0^* is contained in $\mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty}$. This provides a natural morphism of Poisson algebras

$$\varphi : \mathscr{O}(\mathfrak{g}^0)^m \longrightarrow R(\mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M}), \mathfrak{g}^\infty, I)$$

for all ideals $I \subseteq \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g}^\infty)$, by composing μ_0^* with the canonical projection to the Hamiltonian reduction $\pi : \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty} \longrightarrow R(\mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M}), \mathfrak{g}^\infty, I)$.

This is the correspondence we invoke to say that $\{H_i^{\mathrm{Sch}}\}_i$ is a reduction of the classical SLIMS of a star. Indeed, we've shown that $\mu_0^*(H_i^{\mathrm{Sch}}) = H_i : \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})$. Now, since actually H_i takes values in the invariant part $\mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty}$, one may reduce it to a function $\pi(H_i)$ defined on any symplectic reduction $\mathbb{M}//_{\mathcal{O}}G^\infty \times \mathbf{B}$ of the above trivial Poisson fibration. One then has $\varphi(H_i^{\mathrm{Sch}}) = \pi(H_i)$, by definition.

10.6. **The quantum reduction.**

One can now use the quantum constructions which are analogue to the above classical ones. Let us first recall what one means by a quantum moment map. To this end, pick an associative algebra A equipped with a $\mathfrak{g}$-action, i.e. a morphism $\widehat{\xi} : \mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Der}(A)$ of Lie algebras.

Definition 10.2. A quantum moment for the $\mathfrak{g}$-action is a morphism $\widehat{\mu} : U(\mathfrak{g}) \longrightarrow A$ of associative algebras that lifts $\widehat{\xi}$ through the adjoint action:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & A \\ & \overset{\widehat{\mu}}{\nearrow} & \big\downarrow \mathrm{ad} \\ U(\mathfrak{g}) & \xrightarrow[\widehat{\xi}]{} & \mathrm{Der}(A) \end{array}$$

The lifting condition means that

$$\mathrm{ad}(\widehat{\mu}(a)).b = \big[\widehat{\mu}(a), b\big] = \widehat{\xi}(a).b, \qquad \text{for } a \in U(\mathfrak{g}), b \in A.$$

Just as in the classical case, the action is determined by the quantum moment. Moreover, the moment is uniquely determined by the restriction to $\mathfrak{g} \subseteq U(\mathfrak{g})$, which will be a Lie algebras' morphism.

Now suppose to be in the context of filtered quantisation. Assume hence that A is filtered, and that $A_0 = \mathrm{gr}(A)$ is commutative. Introduce the notation $\sigma' : A \longrightarrow A_0$ and

$\sigma : U(\mathfrak{g}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g})$ the grading maps (i.e. the semiclassical limits). Pick momenta $\widehat{\mu} : \mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow A$ and $\mu : \mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow A_0$.[6]

Definition 10.3. The quantum moment $\widehat{\mu} : U(\mathfrak{g}) \longrightarrow A$ is quantisation of the classical moment $\mu : \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g}) \longrightarrow A_0$ if they are intertwined by the semiclassical limits:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \overset{\widehat{\mu}}{} & \\ U(\mathfrak{g}) & \longrightarrow & A \\ \sigma \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \sigma' \\ \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g}) & \underset{\mu}{\longrightarrow} & A_0 \end{array}$$

In particular, if $\widehat{\xi} : \mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Der}(A)$ and $\xi : \mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Der}(A_0)$ are the actions defined by the above momenta, then one will have $\xi \circ \sigma = \sigma' \circ \widehat{\xi}$ as well, since

$$\xi\big(\sigma\widehat{a}\big).b = \{\mu(\sigma\widehat{a}), b\} = \{\mu(\sigma\widehat{a}), \sigma'\widehat{b}\} = \{\sigma'\widehat{\mu}(\widehat{a}), \sigma'(\widehat{b})\} = \sigma'\big[\widehat{\mu}(\widehat{a}), \widehat{b}\big] = \sigma'\widehat{\xi}(\widehat{a}).\widehat{b},$$

for all $\widehat{a} \in U(\mathfrak{g}), b \in A_0$, and for all lift $\widehat{b} \in A$.

Let us get back to our situation, where $\mathrm{GL}(W^0)$ is acting symplectically on $(\mathbb{M}, \omega_a)$ with comoment $\mu_0^* : \mathrm{Sym}\big((\mathfrak{g}^0)^*\big) \longrightarrow \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M}) =: A_0$. One can provide a natural quantisation of it. Namely, one defines $\widehat{\mu^*}_0 : U\big((\mathfrak{g}^0)^*\big) \longrightarrow A = W(\mathbb{M}^*, \omega_a)$ by showing that the auxiliary morphism

$$\widetilde{\mu^*}_0 : \mathrm{Tens}\big((\mathfrak{g}^0)^*\big) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Tens}(T^*L_i), \qquad \widetilde{\mu^*}_0 : de_{jk} \longmapsto \sum_m d(ef^{(i)})_{jm} \otimes d(f^{(i)}e)_{mk},$$

induces an associative morphism of the quantum algebras thanks to the universal property of the quotient. Just as before, one can fix $i \in I^\infty$, and admits that all results will glue as they have to, because of the universal property of the direct sum. Moreover, it turns out to be simpler to check this for the trace-dual version. Consider thus the map

$$\alpha : \mathrm{Tens}(\mathfrak{g}^0) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Tens}(T^*L_i), \qquad \alpha : e_{jk} \longmapsto \sum_m (f^{(i)}e)_{mk} \otimes (ef^{(i)})_{jm}.$$

To get to this map, one indeed uses the dualities

$$\mathrm{Tr} : de_{jk} \longmapsto e_{kj}, \qquad \mathrm{Tr} : d(ef^{(i)})_{jk} \longmapsto (f^{(i)}e)_{kj}, \qquad \mathrm{Tr} : d(f^{(i)}e)_{jk} \longmapsto (ef^{(i)})_{kj},$$

provided by the trace. A last point must however be made: the linear isomorphism $\mathrm{Tr} : (\mathbb{M}, \omega_a) \longrightarrow (\mathbb{M}^*, \omega_a)$ is anti-symplectic, since the trace reverses the orientation chosen for the arrows of $\mathcal{G}$. To be more explicit, the isomorphism $\varphi : \mathbb{M}^* \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}$ provided by the symplectic pairing is canonical, whereas the isomorphism $\mathrm{Tr} : \mathbb{M}^* \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}$ is noncanonical (it relies on the choice of a polarisation for $(\mathbb{M}, \omega_a)$), and they differ by a sign:

$$\varphi : d(ef^{(i)})_{jk} \longmapsto -(f^{(i)}e)_{kj}, \qquad \varphi : d(f^{(i)}e)_{jk} \longmapsto (ef^{(i)})_{kj}$$

Hence one should prove that α induces a morphism with the Weyl algebra for the opposite symplectic structure, and this is precisely what happens.

Proposition 27. *The map $\alpha : \mathrm{Tens}(\mathfrak{g}^0) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Tens}(T^*L_i)$ induces an associative morphism $\widehat{\varphi} : U(\mathfrak{g}^0) \longrightarrow W(T^*L_i, \omega_a^{\mathrm{op}})$, where ω_a^{op} is the opposite symplectic structure.*

[6] A classical moment is just a Poisson morphism in this context. It will be the moment map of a classical action $\xi : \mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Der}(A_0)$ if one has $\{\mu(a), b\} = \xi(a).b$ for all $a \in \mathfrak{g}, b \in A_0$.

The proof has been postponed to § 14. This proposition shows that the definition

$$\widehat{\mu^*}_0\big(\widehat{de}_{jk}\big) = \sum_m \widehat{d(ef^{(i)})}_{jm} \cdot \widehat{d(f^{(i)}e)}_{mk} \in A$$

makes sense. The conceptual reason why this works is that μ_0^* is Poisson. It is straightforward to check that this maps quantises μ_0^*. Moreover, it now defines a quantum $\mathfrak{g}^0$-action $\widehat{\xi}_0 : \mathfrak{g}^0 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Der}(A)$ that quantises the classical $\xi_0 : \mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Der}(A_0)$.

Proposition 28. *One has* $\widehat{\mu_0^*}\big(\widehat{H}_i^{\mathrm{KZ}}\big) = \widehat{H}_i$.

Proof. This equality makes sense by using the canonical trace-duality, as above. By linearity, it will be enough to show that

$$\widehat{\mu^*}_0\big(\,\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{R}_i\widehat{R}_j)\big) = \mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_i\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_j),$$

for $i \neq j \in I^\infty$. Indeed, one knows that the $\sum_{j\neq i} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{R}_i\widehat{R}_j)}{t_i - t_j} \in U(\mathfrak{g}^*)^{\otimes m}$ is the trace-dual of $\sum_{j\neq i} \frac{\Omega_{ij}}{t_i-t_j} = \widehat{H}_i^{\mathrm{KZ}}$, because KZ quantises Schlesinger. The result now follows by the straightforward expansion

$$\widehat{\mu^*}_0\big(\,\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{R}_i\widehat{R}_j)\big) = \sum_{k,l} \widehat{\mu^*}_0\big((\widehat{R}_i)_{kl}\big) \cdot \widehat{\mu^*}_0\big((\widehat{R}_j)_{lk}\big) = \sum_{k,l} \widehat{\mu^*}_0\big(\widehat{de^{(i)}}_{kl}\big) \cdot \widehat{\mu^*}_0\big(\widehat{de^{(j)}}_{lk}\big) =$$

$$= \sum_{k,l,m,n} \widehat{d(ef^{(i)})}_{km} \cdot \widehat{d(f^{(i)}e)}_{ml} \cdot \widehat{d(ef^{(j)})}_{ln} \cdot \widehat{d(f^{(j)}e)}_{nk} = \sum_{k,l,m,n} (\widehat{Q}_i)_{km} \cdot (\widehat{P}_i)_{ml} \cdot (\widehat{Q}_j)_{ln} \cdot (\widehat{P}_j)_{nl} =$$

$$= \mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_i\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_j),$$

because by definition the quantum variables $(\widehat{R}_i)_{kl}, (\widehat{Q}_i)_{km}$ and $(\widehat{P}_i)_{ml}$ corresponds to the generators

$$\widehat{de}^{(i)}_{kl} \in U(\mathfrak{g}^*), \qquad \widehat{d(ef^{(i)})}_{kl}, \widehat{d(f^{(i)}e)}_{ml} \in A.$$

□

Hence one has lifted the classical correspondence to a quantum one. One should again perform the "quantum" change of variables $\widehat{R}_i := \widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_i$ in order to retrieve KZ (6) from the simply-laced quantum connection (5). We view this as a quantum reduction, in the following sense.

10.7. **Howe pairs and quantum Hamiltonian reduction.**

We start by providing the most straightforward quantum analogue of the notion of a symplectic dual pair. Consider three associative algebras A, B_1, B_2.

Definition 10.4. [7] A pair of associative morphisms $\widehat{\mu^*}_i : B_i \longrightarrow A$ is a Howe dual pair if one has

$$\big[\widehat{\mu^*}_1(B_1), \widehat{\mu^*}_2(B_2)\big]_A = 0,$$

where $[\cdot,\cdot]_A$ is the commutator in A. Moreover, this is said to be a quantisation of the symplectic dual Pair $\mu_i^* : \mathscr{O}(P_i) \longrightarrow \mathscr{O}(M)$ if B_i is a quantisation of $\mathscr{O}(P_i), A$ is a

[7] This is again the weakest notion one finds around. One could require that $\widehat{\mu^*}_i(B_i) \subseteq A$ be the mutual centraliser of one another into A. This latter notion admits a representation-theoretic analogue concerning the action of a product $G_1 \times G_2$ of two (algebraic) groups on a finite-dimensional vector space, which is the actual definition of a Howe pair (see [How89]). Nevertheless, we won't be needing any of this to discuss our quantum reduction.

quantisation of $\mathscr{O}(M)$ and the semiclassical limits $\sigma_i : B_i \longrightarrow \mathscr{O}(P_i), \sigma : A \longrightarrow \mathscr{O}(M)$ are intertwined:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \widehat{\mu^*}_i & \\ B_i & \longrightarrow & A \\ \sigma_i \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \sigma \\ \mathscr{O}(P_i) & \longrightarrow & \mathscr{O}(M) \\ & \mu_i^* & \end{array}$$

One can show that the quantum momenta $\widehat{\mu}_0^*, \widehat{\mu}_\infty^*$ for the actions of $\mathrm{GL}(W^0)$ and $\mathrm{GL}(W^\infty)$ provide such a Howe pair.

Proposition 29. *One has*

$$\left[\widehat{\mu}_0^*\big(U(\mathfrak{g}^0)\big), \widehat{\mu}_\infty^*\big(U(\mathfrak{g}^\infty)\big)\right]_A = 0.$$

The proof is a straightforward computation, postponed to the appendix § 14, which uses the explicit formula

$$\widehat{\mu^*}_\infty(\widehat{df}_{kl}) = \sum_n \widehat{d(fe)}_{kn} \cdot \widehat{d(ef)}_{nl} \in A.$$

In particular, the image of $\widehat{\mu^*}_0$ inside A is contained in the invariant subalgebra

$$A^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty} := \left\{ \widehat{f} \in A \middle| \left[\widehat{\mu^*}_\infty\big(U(\mathfrak{g}^\infty)\big), \widehat{f}\ \right]_A \right\} \subseteq A.$$

This can be used to provide an correspondence between the quantum algebra $U(\mathfrak{g}^0)^{\otimes m}$ and all quantum reductions $R_q(A, \mathfrak{g}^\infty, I)$. Recall that this is defined using the moment $\widehat{\mu^*}_\infty : U(\mathfrak{g}^\infty) \longrightarrow A$ and an ideal $I \subseteq U(\mathfrak{g}^\infty)$. As in the classical case, one considers the left ideal $J := A.\widehat{\mu^*}_\infty(I) \subseteq A$ generated by $\widehat{\mu^*}_\infty(I)$. This need not be a two-sided ideal.

Lemma 30. *The invariant part $J^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty} \subseteq A^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty}$ is a two-sided ideal.*

Proof. It is clear that $J^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty} = J \cap A^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty}$ is a left ideal in $A^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty}$. To see that it is bilateral, pick $c \in A^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty}, b \in J^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty}$. One may write $b = \sum_i b_i \widehat{\mu^*}_\infty(a_i)$ for suitable $b_i \in A, a_i \in I$. Then:

$$bc = \sum_i b_i \widehat{\mu^*}_\infty(a_i)c = \sum_i b_i c \widehat{\mu^*}_\infty(a_i) + b_i[\widehat{\mu^*}_\infty(a_i), c] = \sum_i b_i c \widehat{\mu^*}_\infty(a_i) \in J^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty},$$

because c is $\mathfrak{g}^\infty$-invariant. □

Definition 10.5. The quantum Hamiltonian reduction of A with respect to the quantum moment $\widehat{\mu^*}_\infty : U(\mathfrak{g}^\infty) \longrightarrow A$ and the ideal $I \subseteq U(\mathfrak{g}^\infty)$ is the quotient:

$$R_q(A, \mathfrak{g}, I) := A^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty} / J^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty}.$$

Notice that this quotient is an associative algebra, because of the above lemma.

One thus has an arrow $\widehat{\varphi} : U(\mathfrak{g}^0)^{\otimes m} \longrightarrow R_q(A, \mathfrak{g}^\infty, I)$, composing $\widehat{\mu^*}_0$ with the canonical projection $\pi : A^{\mathfrak{g}^\infty} \longrightarrow R_q(A, \mathfrak{g}^\infty, I)$. Finally, the results of the previous section show that

$$\widehat{\varphi}(\widehat{H}_i^{\mathrm{KZ}}) = \pi(\widehat{H_i}),$$

and the right-hand side is precisely the reduction of the (G^∞-invariant) quantum SLIMS with respect to the G^∞-action.

11. DMT vs the dual star

We want to show that the DMT connection is a reduction of the SLQC connection for the Harnad-dual picture to the previous one. The main ideas of the proof are exactly as for KZ. We will prove the following statements.

Theorem 31. *The dual Schlesinger connection quantises to the DMT-Casimir connections via the standard PBW isomorphism.*

This is proven in § 11.3.

Theorem 32. *The SLIMS reduces to the dual Schlesinger system, in the special case of the degenerate reading of a star with no regular times.*

This is proven in § 11.4.

Theorem 33. *A natural correction of the SLQC reduces to the DMT system, in the same case as above. The correction produces a strongly-flat connection whose difference with the SLQC vanishes when taking the semiclassical limit. In particular, a reduction of the SLQC is a quantisation of the dual Schlesinger system.*

This is proven in § 11.5.

11.1. Simply-laced quantum connection of a star: dual version.

One takes $k = 2, a(J) = \{\infty, 0\}$ and $T^\infty = 0$, in the general setup of § 3. The graph $\mathcal{G}$, and the symplectic phase-space $(\mathbb{M}, \omega_a)$ are the same as in § 10.1. What changes is the space of times $\mathbf{B} = \mathbb{C}^{I^0} \setminus \{\text{diags}\}$, and the space of meromorphic connections that these data code, namely:

$$\nabla = d - \left(T^0 + \frac{QP}{z}\right) dz.$$

This is a connection in the trivial vector bundle $W^0 \times \mathbb{C}P^1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}P^1$. One can write $T^0 = \mathrm{diag}(t_1 I_1, \dots, t_m I_m) \in \mathbf{B}$, where I_i is the idempotent for $V_i \subseteq W^0$, and $(Q, P) \in \mathbb{M}$.

The isomonodromic deformations of those connections are controlled by the simply-laced Hamiltonian system

$$\varpi = \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\widetilde{QP} QP\right) = \sum_{i \in I^\infty} H_i dt_i \in \Omega^0(\mathbb{F}_a, \pi^* T^* \mathbf{B}),$$

where $\pi : \mathbb{F}_a = \mathbb{M} \times \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$ is the usual trivial symplectic fibration. The system spells out as

$$H_i(Q, P, T^0) = \sum_{i \neq j \in I^0} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(Q_i P_j Q_j P_i)}{t_i - t_j} \in \mathrm{Sym}(\mathbb{M}^*). \tag{10}$$

The SLQC at hand is then

$$\widehat{\nabla} = d_{\mathbf{B}} - \widehat{\varpi} = d_{\mathbf{B}} - \sum_{i \in I^\infty} \left(\sum_{i \neq j \in I^\infty} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{P}_j \widehat{Q}_j \widehat{P}_i \widehat{Q}_i)}{t_i - t_j} \right) dt_i. \tag{11}$$

This is a connection on the trivial (quantum) vector bundle $\mathbb{E}_a = A \times \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$, where $A := W(\mathbb{M}^*, \omega_a)$.

The main theorem 8 assures that $\widehat{\nabla}$ is strongly flat. Let us set

$$\widehat{H}_i := \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{P}_j \widehat{Q}_j \widehat{P}_i \widehat{Q}_i)}{t_i - t_j},$$

for the quantum Hamiltonians defining the SLQC. One may prove the flatness of this connection in the very same way as Prop. 22. Indeed, the combinatoric of the nontrivial intersections of the degenerate 4-cycles is the same as before, because it only depends on the adjacency of the quiver $\mathcal{G}$, which has not changed.

11.2. **DMT connection.**

Here we briefly recall the construction of the Casimir connection [MTL05]. Consider a simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ over $\mathbb{C}$. Choose a Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$, with associated root system $R \subseteq \mathfrak{h}^*$. Let

$$\mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}} := \mathfrak{h} \setminus \bigcup_{\alpha \in R} \mathrm{Ker}(\sigma_\alpha)$$

be the open complement to the root hyperplanes. This means that $\sigma_\alpha : \mathfrak{h} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{h}$ is the reflection associated to $\alpha \in R$. Let $K : \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be (a multiple of) the Killing form of $\mathfrak{g}$. One can now define a strongly flat connection $\widehat{\nabla}^{\mathrm{DMT}}$ on the trivial vector bundle $U(\mathfrak{g}) \times \mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}}$. Namely, for all $\alpha \in R$ one chooses a $\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$-triplet of vectors $e_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha, f_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}, h_\alpha = [e_\alpha, f_\alpha] \in \mathfrak{h}$, and then

$$\widehat{\nabla}^{\mathrm{DMT}} := d_{\mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}}} - \sum_{\alpha \in R} \frac{K(\alpha,\alpha)}{2} (\widehat{e}_\alpha \cdot \widehat{f}_\alpha + \widehat{f}_\alpha \cdot \widehat{e}_\alpha) \frac{d\alpha}{\alpha},$$

where $K(\alpha,\alpha) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is the length squared of the root α, computed with the dual of the Killing form (still abusively noted K).[8]

We will now specialise this connection to the case of $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{gl}_l(\mathbb{C})$, noting that this Lie algebra is reductive but not semi-simple. One can just consider an invariant nondegenerate bilinear symmetric form on $\mathfrak{g}$ to perform the same construction as above, and we will use $K(X,Y) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}(XY)$, for $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$. We can choose $\mathfrak{h} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ to be the subalgebra of diagonal matrices. Now the root system $R = R(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ reads

$$R = \{\alpha_{ij} : \mathfrak{h} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}\}_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq l}, \qquad \text{where } \alpha_{ij}(\mathrm{diag}(x_1, \ldots, x_l)) := x_i - x_j.$$

Moreover, one has

$$\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_{ij}} = \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{e_{ij}\}, \qquad \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha_{ij}} = \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_{ji}} = \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{e_{ji}\},$$

so that $h_{\alpha_{ij}} = [e_{ij}, e_{ji}] = e_{ii} - e_{jj} \in \mathfrak{h}$. This is indeed the dual root to α_{ij} with respect to Tr, as

$$\mathrm{Tr}(h_{\alpha_{ij}} e_{kl}) = \mathrm{Tr}(e_{ii}e_{kl}) - \mathrm{Tr}(e_{jj}e_{kl}) = \delta_{ik}\,\mathrm{Tr}(e_{il}) - \delta_{jk}\,\mathrm{Tr}(e_{jl}) = \delta_{ik}\delta_{il} - \delta_{jk}\delta_{jl} = \alpha_{ij}(e_{kl}).$$

[8] Just as for KZ, the constant in front of the 1-form

$$\widehat{\varpi}^{\mathrm{DMT}} := \sum_{\alpha \in R} \frac{K(\alpha,\alpha)}{2} (\widehat{e}_\alpha \cdot \widehat{f}_\alpha + \widehat{f}_\alpha \cdot \widehat{e}_\alpha) d\log(\alpha) \in \Omega^1\big(\mathbf{B}, U(\mathfrak{g})\big)$$

is not a concern here. One could introduce any deformation parameter $\hbar \in \mathbb{C}$ in front of it. Moreover, this is the universal version of the DMT connection: one may pick any $\mathfrak{g}$-module V and use it for the generic fibre of the trivial vector bundle.

The lenght squared of all roots is given by

$$2K(\alpha_{ij},\alpha_{ij}) = \mathrm{Tr}(h_{\alpha_{ij}}h_{\alpha_{ij}}) = \mathrm{Tr}(e_{ii}) + \mathrm{Tr}(e_{jj}) - 2\,\mathrm{Tr}(e_{ii}e_{jj}) = 2.$$

Finally, notice that if one introduces the usual global coordinates $\{t_i\}_{1\leq i\leq l}$ on $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}}$, then one has

$$d\log(\alpha_{ij}) = d\big(\log(t_i - t_j)\big) = \frac{dt_i - dt_j}{t_i - t_j}.$$

Putting all this together, one finds

$$\widehat{\nabla}^{\mathrm{DMT}} = d_{\mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}}} - \sum_i \widehat{H}_i^{\mathrm{DMT}} dt_i, \tag{12}$$

if one sets

$$\widehat{H}_i^{\mathrm{DMT}} := \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j\neq i} \frac{\widehat{e}_{ij}\cdot\widehat{e}_{ji} + \widehat{e}_{ji}\cdot\widehat{e}_{ij}}{t_i - t_j} : \mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}} \longrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g}).$$

These are by definition the DMT Hamiltonians.

Dual Schlesinger system.

Pick a complex reductive group G, with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. Consider the trivial Poisson fibration $\mathfrak{g}^*\times\mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}}$, where $\mathfrak{h}\subseteq\mathfrak{g}\cong\mathfrak{g}^*$ is Cartan. One lets $(R,T^0)\in\mathfrak{g}\times\mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}}$ parametrise the following set of $\mathfrak{g}$-valued meromorphic connections on trivial G-bundles over $\mathbb{C}P^1$:

$$\nabla = d - \left(T^0 + \frac{R}{z}\right)dz.$$

One can show that the isomonodromy differential equations of such connections admit an Hamiltonian formulation. Namely, one defines

$$\varpi := K\left(R, \mathrm{ad}_{T^0}^{-1}[dT^0, R]\right) = K\left(R, \widetilde{R}\right),$$

where K is an invariant nondegenerate bilinear symmetric form on $\mathfrak{g}$, and where R is a local section of the fibration. Next, by choosing global coordinates $\{t_i\}_i$ on $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}}$, one writes

$$\varpi = \sum_i H_i^{\mathrm{dSch}} dt_i,$$

for functions $H_i^{\mathrm{dSch}} : \mathfrak{g}^*\times\mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$. This is by definition the dual Schlesinger system. Specialising all this to $G = \mathrm{GL}_l(\mathbb{C})$ as before, one has

$$\sum_i H_i^{\mathrm{dSch}} dt_i = \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{Tr}\left(\widetilde{R}R\right).$$

Notice that

$$\widetilde{R}_{ij} = \begin{cases} d\log(t_i - t_j)R_{ij}, & i\neq j, \\ 0, & i = j \end{cases},$$

and so

$$\frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{Tr}(\widetilde{R}R) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j}\widetilde{R}_{ij}R_{ji} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i\neq j}\frac{R_{ij}R_{ji}}{t_i - t_j}(dt_i - dt_j).$$

This provides the explicit expansion

$$H_i^{\mathrm{dSch}} = H_i^{\mathrm{dSch}}(R,T^0) = \sum_{j\neq i}\frac{R_{ij}R_{ji}}{t_i - t_j}. \tag{13}$$

11.3. **DMT is a quantisation of dual Schlesinger.**

It is argued in [Boa02] that the DMT connection is a quantisation of the dual Schlesinger system. After all the above preparation, it follows from the following observation. The (classical) dual Schlesinger Hamiltonians can be written

$$H_i^{\mathrm{dSch}} = \sum_{j\neq i} \frac{e_{ij}\otimes e_{ji}}{t_i - t_j},$$

if one thinks of them as smooth sections $H_i : \mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g}^*) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g})$. The PBW quantisation (9) of the numerator is by definition

$$\mathcal{Q}(e_{ij}\otimes e_{ji}) = \frac{\widehat{e}_{ij}\cdot\widehat{e}_{ji} + \widehat{e}_{ji}\cdot\widehat{e}_{ij}}{2},$$

so that one has on the whole $\mathcal{Q}(H_i^{\mathrm{dSch}}) = \widehat{H}_i^{\mathrm{DMT}}$.

11.4. **The classical reduction.**

To get the dual Schlesinger system (13) from the simply-laced system (10), one should first restrict itself to the case where $\dim(V_i) = 1$ for all $i \in I^0$. Notice that this implies $\dim(W^0) = |I^0| =: l$. In this case $\mathbf{B} = \mathbb{C}^l \setminus \{\mathrm{diags}\} \cong \mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}}$, where $\mathfrak{h}$ is the standard Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{gl}(W^0) \cong \mathfrak{gl}_l(\mathbb{C})$.

Now, as in § 10.4, one considers the classical (co)moment

$$\mu_0^* : \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g}^0) \longrightarrow \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})$$

for the $\mathrm{GL}(W^0)$-action. This is the dual map to

$$\mu_0 : \mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^0, \qquad (Q,P) \longmapsto R := QP.$$

Now one can show that $\mu_0^*(H_i^{\mathrm{dSch}}) = H_i$ for all $i \in I^0$. Notice that in this case there are no traces to take, as the endomorphism $Q_iP_jQ_jP_i : V_i \longrightarrow V_i$ is a scalar for all $i \neq j$. Hence indeed

$$\mu_0^*(H_i^{\mathrm{dSch}}) = \mu_0^*\left(\sum_{i\neq j}\frac{R_{ij}R_{ji}}{t_i - t_j}\right) = \sum_{i\neq j}\frac{Q_iP_jQ_jP_i}{t_i - t_j} = \sum_{i\neq j}\frac{\mathrm{Tr}(Q_iP_jQ_jP_i)}{t_i - t_j} = H_i,$$

by means of the change of variable $R_{ij} := Q_iP_j \in \mathbb{C}$. The conceptual justification of this computation is again the explicit formula

$$\mu_0^*(de_{ij}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\dim(W^\infty)} d(e^{(i)}f)_k \otimes d(fe^{(j)})_k,$$

where $\{de_{ij} := e_j \otimes de_i\} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}^0$ is the canonical basis (with $V_i = \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{e_i\}$), and with $d(e^{(i)}f)_k := e_i \otimes df_k, d(fe^{(j)})_k := f_k \otimes de_j$, fixing a basis $\{f_k\}_k$ of W^∞. Indeed, with these notation one has $R_{ij} = de_{ij}(R)$, and the slightly more complicated

$$Q_iP_j = \sum_{k=1}^{\dim(W^\infty)} (Q_i)_k(P_j)_k = \sum_k d(e^{(i)}f)_k(Q)\cdot d(fe^{(j)})_k(P) = \sum_k d(e^{(i)}f)_k \otimes d(fe^{(j)})_k(QP),$$

where $(Q_i)_k : \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow V_i, (P_j)_k : V_j \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ are the components of $Q_i : W^\infty \longrightarrow V_i$ and $P_j : V_j \longrightarrow W^\infty$ in the subspace $\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{f_k\} \subseteq W^\infty$. We view this as a reduction, in the same sense in which Schlesinger (8) is a reduction of the SLIMS for a star (4) (see § 10.4 and § 10.5).

11.5. **The quantum reduction.**

Following the same strategy as in § 10.6 and § 10.7, one would like to implement the quantum change of variable $\widehat{R}_{ij} := \widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_j$ to show that the formula for the DMT connection (12) expands to that of the simply-laced quantum connection (11). The precise justification for this would again be the natural quantisation $\widehat{\mu}_0^* : U(\mathfrak{g}^0) \longrightarrow A$ of the moment map of the previous section. By doing this, however, one does not recover the words that make up the the Hamiltonians $\widehat{H}_i$ of the SLQC. Rather:

$$\widehat{\mu}_0^*\left(\sum_{i\neq j}\frac{\widehat{R}_{ij}\widehat{R}_{ji}}{t_i-t_j}\right) = \sum_{i\neq j}\frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_j\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_i)}{t_i-t_j},$$

where as usual one writes $\widehat{R}_{ij} = \widehat{de}_{ij} \in U\big((\mathfrak{g}^*)^0\big)$ and

$$\widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_j = \sum_k (\widehat{Q}_i)_k(\widehat{P}_j)_k = \sum_k \widehat{de^{(i)}f}_k \cdot \widehat{dfe^{(j)}}_k \in A$$

for the natural quantisations of $de_{ij} \in \mathscr{O}(\mathfrak{g}^0)$ and $d(e^{(i)}f)_k, d(fe^{(j)})_k \in \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M}) = A_0$. This means that the actual quantum connection that reduces to DMT is

$$\widehat{\nabla}' = d_{\mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}}} - \sum_{i\in I^0}\widehat{H}'_i dt_i,$$

still defined on the trivial vector bundle $\mathbb{E}_a = A \times \mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}}$, where

$$\widehat{H}'_i = \sum_{j\neq i}\frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_j\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_i)}{t_i-t_j}.$$

This connection is clearly a close relative to the simply-laced quantum connection (11). Indeed, it just amounts to a change of anchoring of all quantum potentials defining the Hamiltonians $\widehat{H}_i$: instead of anchoring all degenerate 4-cycles at their centre, one anchors them at their starting node.[9] The following proposition shows that the difference between $\widehat{\nabla}$ and $\widehat{\nabla}'$ is negligible as $\hbar \longrightarrow +\infty$.

Proposition 34. *The A-valued one-form $\widehat{\nabla} - \widehat{\nabla}' \in \Omega^1(\mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}}, A)$ vanishes in the semiclassical limit.*

Proof. This means that the element

$$\langle\widehat{\nabla} - \widehat{\nabla}', \partial_{t_i}\rangle = H'_i - H_i = \sum_{j\neq i}\frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_j\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_i) - \mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{P}_j\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_i\widehat{Q}_i)}{t_i-t_j} \in A$$

lies in the kernel of the grading map $\mathrm{gr} : A \longrightarrow A_0$ for all $\{t_i\}_i \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}}$. In the chosen notation, this is seen to be true because the identity $\mathrm{Tr}(Q_iP_jQ_jP_j) = \mathrm{Tr}(P_jQ_jP_iQ_i)$ holds for matrices Q_i, P_i, Q_j, P_j having coefficients in a commutative ring ($\mathbb{C}$, in this case), and because of the definition of quantum potentials of § 6: namely, the functions $\mathrm{Tr}(Q_iP_jQ_jP_j), \mathrm{Tr}(P_jQ_jP_iQ_i) \in A_0$ are the semiclassical limit of the quantum operators $\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_j\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_i), \mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{P}_j\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_i\widehat{Q}_i) \in A$.

[9]Notice that if one had defined the SLQC making this latter of anchoring, then an analogous correction would have been needed to recover KZ, which is part of the motivation for choosing the former one.

One can moreover provide an explicit formula for the above difference, using the proof of Prop. 7 that appears in the appendix § 14:

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_j\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_i) - \mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_j\widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_i) = \mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{P}_j\widehat{Q}_j).$$

To show this, one uses the fact that $\big[(\widehat{Q}_i)_k, (\widehat{P}_i)_k\big] = 1$ in the quantum algebra A. This also gives an equivalent proof that the semiclassical limit of the difference must vanish: if one added the deformation parameter $\hbar$ into the picture, via the universal construction of § 5.2, then the operator of order two $\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{P}_j\widehat{Q}_j) \in A$ would come with a power $\hbar^k$ of $\hbar$ having an exponent $k > 2$. □

In terms of quantum cycles, the above proof can be sketched by



This is a valid identity in the space $\widehat{\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}}$. As a final application of the material about quantum traces introduced in § 6, one can quickly conclude the following.

Proposition 35. *The corrected SLQC $\widehat{\nabla}'$ is strongly flat.*

Proof. The only nontrivial thing to prove is that $\big[\widehat{H}'_i, \widehat{H}'_j\big] = 0$ for $i \neq j$, as the other half of strong flatness follows trivially from that of $\widehat{\nabla}$. Now, the above picture says that we can move the anchor of all degenerate 4-cycles of $\widehat{H}'_i$ from the arrow coming out of i to the centre, up to adding a 2-cycle to each of them. One thus has $\widehat{H}'_i = \widehat{H}_i + \sum_{j\neq i} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{C}_{ij})}{t_i - t_j}$, where $\widehat{C}_{ij}$ is a suitable quantum 2-cycle based at the centre, for all $i \neq j$. The following lemma is then enough to conclude. □

Lemma 36. *All quantum 2-cycles commute among themselves and with all degenerate 4-cycles.*

Proof. Thanks to Prop. 10, these commutators are the trivial lifts of the Poisson brackets of their semiclassical limits. It is straightforward to show that both vanish. □

Another meaningful comparison can be made between ∇^{DMT} and the reduction of the simply-laced quantum connection. To compute the latter, notice that one has:

$$\widehat{H}_i = \sum_{j\neq i} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{P}_i\widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_j\widehat{Q}_j)}{t_i - t_j} = \sum_{j\neq i} \frac{1}{t_i - t_j}\Big(\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_i\widehat{P}_j\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_i) - \mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_j\widehat{P}_j) + 1\Big),$$

using the commutation relations of A. The reduction of this is

$$\pi(\widehat{H}_i) = \sum_{j\neq i} \frac{1}{t_i - t_j}\Big(\widehat{e}_{ij}\cdot\widehat{e}_{ji} - \widehat{e}_{jj} + 1\Big).$$

Notice that adding diagonal elements $\widehat{e}_{ii}$ does not tamper with flatness, because of

$$\big[e_{ij}e_{ji}, e_{kk}\big] = 0, \qquad \text{for all } k.$$

This is the reduction of the cycle-theoretic statement that all 2-cycles commute with all degenerate 4-cycles. The difference between this reduced connection and DMT is analogous to the difference between DMT and a reduction of the FMTV connection (to be explicitly written down at the end of § 12.3).

12. FMTV vs the bipartite graph

Combining § 10 and § 11 leads to the fact that for the case of a complete bipartite graph the simply laced quantum connection reduces to the FMTV connection [FMTV00], as we shall argue momentarily. More precisely, we will show the following.

Theorem 37. *The SLIMS reduce to the JMMS system, in the special case of the degenerate reading of a complete bipartite graph.*

This is proven in § 12.2.

Theorem 38. *A restriction of the FMTV connection can be corrected to obtain the PBW quantisation of the JMMS system. Hence the FMTV system quantises the JMMS system.*

This is proven in § 12.3.

Theorem 39. *A natural correction of the SLQC reduces to the FMTV system, in the special case of the degenerate reading of a complete bipartite graph. The correction produces a connection whose difference with the SLQC vanishes when taking the semiclassical limit. In particular, a reduction of the SLQC is a quantisation of JMMS.*

This is proven in § 12.4.

12.1. Simply-laced quantum connection of a bipartite graph.

The constructions of § 10.1 and § 11.1 generalise as follows. One still has $k = 2$ and $a(J) = \{+\infty, 0\}$, but $\mathcal{G}$ is now an arbitrary bipartite graph on nodes $I = I^0 \coprod I^\infty$. The base space of times is

$$\mathbf{B} = \mathbb{C}^{|I^\infty|} \setminus \{\text{diags}\} \times \mathbb{C}^{|I^0|} \setminus \{\text{diags}\}.$$

The vector phase-space is

$$\mathbb{M} = \mathrm{Hom}(W^\infty, W^0) \oplus \mathrm{Hom}(W^0, W^\infty),$$

equipped with the symplectic form $\omega_a = \mathrm{Tr}(dQ \wedge dP)$, where Q, P have the same meaning as in § 10.1 and § 11.1. If $W^\infty = \bigoplus_{i\in I^\infty} V_i^\infty$ and $W^0 = \bigoplus_{i\in I^0} V_i^0$, then one will write Q_{ij} for the component of Q in $(V_j^\infty)^* \otimes V_i^0$, and P_{ji} for the component of P in $(V_j^0)^* \otimes V_i^\infty$. Those data code a space of meromorphic connections of the form

$$\nabla = d - \left(T^0 + \sum_{i\in I^\infty} \frac{Q_i P_i}{z - t_i^\infty} \right) dz,$$

on the trivial vector bundle $W^0 \times \mathbb{C}P^1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}P^1$, with respect to the coarser decomposition $P_i : W^0 \longrightarrow V_i^\infty, Q_i : V_i^\infty \longrightarrow W^0$. The isomonodromic deformations of those connections are coded by the Hamiltonian system

$$\varpi = \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{Tr}\left(\widetilde{PQ}PQ\right) + \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{Tr}(\widetilde{QP}QP) = \sum_{i\in I^\infty} H_i^\infty dt_i^\infty + \sum_{j\in I^0} H_j^0 dt_j^0,$$

which spells out as

$$\begin{aligned} H_i^\infty(Q,P,T^\infty,T^0) &= \sum_{k\in I^\infty\setminus\{i\},j,l\in I^0} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(P_{il}Q_{lk}P_{kj}Q_{ji})}{t_i^\infty - t_k^\infty} + \sum_{j\in I^0} t_j^0\,\mathrm{Tr}(P_{ij}Q_{ji}), \\ H_j^0(Q,P,T^\infty,T^0) &= \sum_{l\in I^0\setminus\{j\},i,k\in I^\infty} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(Q_{ji}P_{il}Q_{lk}P_{kj})}{t_j^0 - t_l^0} + \sum_{i\in I^\infty} t_i^\infty\,\mathrm{Tr}(Q_{ji}P_{ij}). \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

One now has nondegenerate 4-cycles, as well as 2-cycles. The SLQC at hand is

$$\widehat{\nabla} = d_{\mathbf{B}} - \widehat{\varpi} = d_{\mathbf{B}} - \sum_{i\in I^\infty} \widehat{H}_i^\infty dt_i^\infty - \sum_{j\in I^0} \widehat{H}_0^j dt_j^0, \tag{15}$$

on the trivial vector bundle $\mathbb{E}_a = A \times \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$, where $A := W(\mathbb{M}^*, \omega_a)$. The explicit quantum Hamiltonians are

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{H}_i^\infty = &\sum_{k\in I^\infty\setminus\{i\}, j\neq l\in I^0} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{P}_{il}\widehat{Q}_{lk}\widehat{P}_{kj}\widehat{Q}_{ji})}{t_i^\infty - t_k^\infty} + \sum_{k\in I^\infty\setminus\{i\}, j\in I^0} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_{jk}\widehat{P}_{kj}\widehat{Q}_{ji}\widehat{P}_{ij})}{t_i^\infty - t_k^\infty} + \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j\in I^0} t_j^0 \Big(\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{P}_{ij}\widehat{Q}_{ji}) + \mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_{ji}\widehat{P}_{ij}) \Big), \\
\widehat{H}_j^0 = &\sum_{l\in I^0\setminus\{j\}, i\neq k\in I^\infty} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_{ji}\widehat{P}_{il}\widehat{Q}_{lk}\widehat{P}_{kj})}{t_j^0 - t_l^0} + \sum_{l\in I^0\setminus\{j\}, i\in I^\infty} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{P}_{jl}\widehat{Q}_{li}\widehat{P}_{ji}\widehat{Q}_{ji})}{t_j^0 - t_l^0} + \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i\in I^\infty} t_i^\infty \Big(\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_{ji}\widehat{P}_{ij}) + \mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{P}_{ij}\widehat{Q}_{ji}) \Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Here one separated nondegenerate 4-cycles (on the left) from degenerate ones, taking care to anchor the latter at their centre rather than at their starting node. The main theorem 8 assures that $\widehat{\nabla}$ is strongly flat.

12.2. **Classical reduction: JMMS system.**

It is argued in [Boa12] that (14) controls isomonodromic deformation equations which correspond to the lifted equations of [JMMS80] (A.5.9). Moreover, the usual change of variable $R_i = Q_i P_i$ provides the JMMS equations themselves ([JMMS80] 4.44 or A.5.1). Just as in § 11.4, one must further restrict T^0 to have simple spectrum in order to recover the setup of JMMS. One finds then a system of time-dependent Hamiltonians $H_i^{\mathrm{JMMS},\infty}, H_j^{\mathrm{JMMS},0}$ controlling the isomonodromic deformations of meromorphic connections of the form

$$\nabla = d - \left(T^0 + \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{R_i}{z - t_i^\infty} \right) dz,$$

on the trivial vector bundle $W^0 \times \mathbb{C}P^1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}P^1$. More precisely, one lets T^0 and $\{t_i^\infty\}_i$ vary, and looks for residues $R_i \in \mathfrak{gl}(W^0) \cong \mathfrak{gl}_l(\mathbb{C})$ such that the monodromy of ∇ stays fixed (where $\dim(W^0) = |I^0| =: l$) . This should be thought as the combination of the isomonodromy problems of § 10 and § 11, and the resulting phase-space for the JMMS Hamiltonians will be the trivial Poisson fibration $\mathfrak{g}^m \times \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$, where $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{gl}_l(\mathbb{C})$ and $\mathbf{B} := \mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}} \times \mathrm{Conf}_m(\mathbb{C})$. Here $\mathfrak{h} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is the standard Cartan subalgebra, and $\mathrm{Conf}_m(\mathbb{C})$ is the space of configurations of m-tuples of points in the complex plane, so that

$$(R_i)_i \in \mathfrak{g}^m, \qquad T^0 \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}}, \qquad \{t_i\}_i \in \mathrm{Conf}_m(\mathbb{C}).$$

The explicit formula for the JMMS Hamiltonians is

$$\begin{aligned}
H_i^{\mathrm{JMMS},\infty} &= \sum_{1\leq k\neq i\leq m} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(R_i R_k)}{t_i^\infty - t_k^\infty} + \mathrm{Tr}(R_i T^0), \\
H_j^{\mathrm{JMMS},0} &= \sum_{1\leq k\neq j\leq l} \sum_{1\leq i,n\leq m} \frac{(R_i)_{jk}(R_n)_{kj}}{t_j^0 - t_k^0} + \sum_{1\leq i\leq m} t_i^\infty \mathrm{Tr}(R_i e_{jj}).
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Indeed, this is precisely equation (A.5.13) of [JMMS80], rewritten according to our notation.[10] To justify why (14) reduces to (16) after changing variables, notice that one has $(R_i)_{jk} = Q_{ji}P_{ik} \in \mathbb{C}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j, k \leq l$. Hence, e.g.

$$\operatorname{Tr}(R_i T^0) = \sum_{j,k} (R_i)_{jk} T^0_{jk} = \sum_{j,k} \delta_{jk} t^0_j (R_i)_{jk} = \sum_j t^0_j Q_{ji} P_{ij} = \sum_j t^0_j \operatorname{Tr}(P_{ij} Q_{ji}),$$

where in the last passage one used the fact that $Q_{ji}P_{ij} : V^0_j \longrightarrow V^0_j$ is a complex number. Similarly

$$\sum_{i \neq k} \operatorname{Tr}(R_i R_k) = \sum_{i \neq k, j, l} (R_i)_{jl} (R_k)_{lj} = \sum_{i \neq k, j, l} Q_{ji} P_{il} Q_{lk} P_{kj} = \sum_{i \neq k, j, l} \operatorname{Tr}(P_{il} Q_{lk} P_{kj} Q_{ji}).$$

The expansions of the terms of $H^{0,\mathrm{JMMS}}_j$ are done similarly. The justification of this formula lies as usual on the components $\mu^i_0 : T^* \operatorname{Hom}(V^\infty_i, W^0) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ of the moment $\mu_0 : \mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^m$, defined by

$$\mu_i(Q_i, P_i) := Q_i P_i, \qquad \mu = \bigoplus_{i \in I^\infty} \mu_i : (Q, P) \longmapsto (Q_i P_i)_i.$$

One could pick bases $\{e_i\}_i$ of W^0 and $\{f_j\}_j$ of W^∞ and write this down in terms of explicit generators of the algebras $\mathscr{O}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathscr{O}(\mathbb{M})$, as done in § 10.4 and § 11.4. Moreover, the same argument of § 10.5 permits to rely this change of variable to the reduction of the SLIMS with respect to the action of $\mathrm{GL}(W^0)$ on $\mathbb{M}$.

As a final remark, notice that the leading term of $H^{\mathrm{JMMS},\infty}_i$ provides the Schlesinger Hamiltonian (8). Similarly the leading term of $H^{\mathrm{JMMS},0}_j$ provides a generalisation of the dual Schlesinger Hamiltonian (13). This generalisation amounts to the fact that now one has several simple poles, corresponding to several residues, instead of just one.

12.3. **FMTV is a quantisation of JMMS.**

Here we briefly recall the construction of the dynamical connection [FMTV00]. One considers the KZ equations for a simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, with an additional parameter $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}$ chosen in a Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$. The equations read

$$\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t^\infty_i} = \left(\mu^{(i)} + \sum_{1 \leq j \neq i \leq m} \frac{\Omega_{ij}}{t^\infty_i - t^\infty_j} \right) \psi, \tag{17}$$

for a section of $\psi : \mathrm{Conf}_m(\mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}$ of the universal KZ vector bundle, where the indices of Ω and μ specify on which factors of the fibre to act. This is equation 3 on page 3 of [FMTV00].[11] Equation 4 on the same page then provides a system of differential equations which is compatible with this version of KZ: the *dynamical equations*. It is a system for ψ with respect to the variable $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}$, in which one recognises a variation of the DMT connection of § 11.2, plus an additional term. Namely, the derivative of ψ in the

[10] We wrote it in this half-expanded form to make it clear that this is indeed the same Hamiltonian system. One should replace $R_i, T^0, t^\infty_i, t^0_j$ with A_i, A_∞, c_i, a_j, respectively.

[11] One should replace $\psi, t^\infty_i, \Omega_{ij}$ with $u, z_i, \Omega^{(ij)}$. Moreover, instead of considering the universal KZ equations, one should pick highest weight $\mathfrak{g}$-modules V_i, and replace $U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}$ with $V = V_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes V_m$. Finally, the choice of a complex parameter k is not relevant here.

direction of $\mu' \in \mathfrak{h}$ is given by:

$$\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \mu'} = \left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} t_i^{\infty} (\mu')^{(i)} + \sum_{\alpha > 0} \frac{\langle \alpha, \mu' \rangle}{\langle \alpha, \mu \rangle} \widehat{e}_\alpha \cdot \widehat{f}_\alpha \right) \psi \tag{18}$$

The rightmost sum is made over positive roots $\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. The superscript of μ' still denotes the factor on which to act, and the symbols $\widehat{e}_\alpha, \widehat{f}_\alpha \in U(\mathfrak{g})$ are the standard quantisations of the vectors $e_\alpha, f_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}$ that together with h_α compose a $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triplet. The full FMTV system consists of those two sets of equations, for a function $\psi : \mathfrak{h} \times \mathrm{Conf}_m(\mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}$. One can now interpret those linear differential equations as a flat connection $\widehat{\nabla}^{\mathrm{FMTV}}$ on the trivial vector bundle $\mathbb{E} := U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes} \times \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$, where $\mathbf{B} := \mathfrak{h} \times \mathrm{Conf}_m(\mathbb{C})$, called the FMTV connection:

$$\widehat{\nabla}^{\mathrm{FMTV}} = d_{\mathbf{B}} - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} \widehat{H}_i^{\mathrm{FMTV},I} dt_i^{\infty} - \sum_{i \leq j \leq l} \widehat{H}_j^{\mathrm{FMTV},II} d\mu'_j, \tag{19}$$

where $l := \dim(\mathfrak{h})$ is the rank of $\mathfrak{g}$, and where one picks linear coordinates $\{\mu'_j\}_j$ on $\mathfrak{h}$,with respect to a fixed basis of the Cartan subalgebra. The time-dependent quantum operators

$$\widehat{H}_i^{\mathrm{FMTV},I}, \widehat{H}_i^{\mathrm{FMTV},II} : \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}$$

are by definition the FMTV Hamiltonians. As done for KZ and DMT in § 10.2 and § 11.2, one can rewrite the system for the reductive Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{gl}_l(\mathbb{C})$, using (a multiple of) the canonical duality induced by the trace pairing. Now it makes sense to compare (i) the restriction of the FMTV Hamiltonians to the regular part $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}}$ of the Cartan subalgebra and (ii) the PBW quantisation of the JMMS system (16).

Proposition 40. *Take $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}_l(\mathbb{C})$. Then:*

(1) *The FMTV Hamiltonian $\widehat{H}_i^{\mathrm{FMTV},I}$ restricts to $\mathcal{Q}\big(H_i^{\mathrm{JMMS},\infty}\big)$ on $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}} \times \mathrm{Conf}_m(\mathbb{C})$.*

(2) *The difference*

$$\left(\widehat{H}_j^{\mathrm{FMTV},II} \Big|_{\mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}} \times \mathrm{Conf}_m(\mathbb{C})} \right) - \mathcal{Q}\big(H_j^{\mathrm{JMMS},0}\big) : \mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}} \times \mathrm{Conf}_m(\mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}$$

vanishes in the semiclassical limit, everywhere on the restricted JMMS base.

Hence the FMTV system is a quantisation of the JMMS system.

Proof. [12] Let us start by showing that the quantisation of the linear addends of (16) yields the additional terms of (17) and (18), when restricted to the regular part $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}}$. Notice that the elements $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}}$ now corresponds to the diagonal matrix $T^0 = \mathrm{diag}(t_1^0, \ldots, t_l^0)$. Similarly, instead of differentiating along a generic direction $\mu' \in \mathfrak{h}$, it is enough to consider partial derivatives with respect to the system of fundamental coweights $\{e_{ii}\}_{1 \leq i \leq l}$, which is a basis of $\mathfrak{h}$. This is a subset of the canonical basis $e_{ij} \in \mathfrak{g}$.

With these identifications, the additional term of (17) can be written

$$\mu^{(i)} = (T^0)^{(i)} = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq l} t_j^0 \widehat{e}_{jj}^{(i)},$$

[12] This proof is suggested by a slight variation of the example on page 4 of [FMTV00], where the FMTV connection is written down for the simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_l(\mathbb{C})$, in terms of the fundamental coweights of the standard Cartan subalgebra of traceless diagonal matrices:

$$\varpi_i = \left(1 - \frac{i}{l}\right) \sum_{1 \leq j \leq i} e_{jj} - \frac{i}{l} \sum_{i < j \leq l} e_{jj}, \qquad i \in \{1, \ldots, l-1\}.$$

where $T^0 = \sum_j t_j^0 e_{jj}$ is the decomposition with respect to the basis of fundamental coweights. This is indeed the PBW quantisation of the linear function

$$\mathrm{Tr}(R_i T^0) = \sum_{1\leq j\leq l} t_j^0 (R_i)_{jj},$$

which appears in the JMMS Hamiltonian $H_i^{\mathrm{JMMS},\infty}$. The justification of this passes through the identification $(R_i)_{jj} = de_{jj}^{(i)}(R) \in \mathbb{C}$, where $de_{jj}^{(i)} \in (\mathfrak{g}^m)^*$ is the appropriate coordinate function. The trace duality sends this element to $e_{jj}^{(i)}$, whose standard PBW quantisation is by definition $\widehat{e}_{jj}^{(i)} \in U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}$ (see (9)).

Similarly, the additional term of (18) becomes

$$\sum_{1\leq i\leq m} t_i^\infty (\mu')^{(i)} = \sum_{1\leq i\leq m} t_i^\infty e_{jj}^{(i)},$$

for $1 \leq j \leq l$. This is because, as explained above, the derivative $\partial_{\mu'}$ has been replaced by the partial derivative $\partial_{t_j^0}$ in the direction of $e_{jj} \in \mathfrak{h}$. This is the quantisation of the linear function

$$\sum_{1\leq i\leq m} t_i^\infty \,\mathrm{Tr}(R_i e_{jj}) = \sum_{i,k,m} t_i^\infty (R_i)_{km}(e_{jj})_{mk} = \sum_{i,k,m} t_i^\infty \delta_{kj}\delta_{mj}(R_i)_{km} = \sum_i t_i^\infty (R_i)_{jj},$$

which appears in the JMMS Hamiltonian $H_j^{\mathrm{JMMS},0}$.

Now, it has been shown in § 10.3 and § 11.3 that the standard PBW quantisation of Schlesinger (eq. (8)) and dual Schlesinger (eq. (13)) yields KZ (eq. (6)) and DMT (eq. (12)), respectively. This means that the restriction to the regular part $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}}$ of the leading term of (17) should coincide with the PBW quantisation of the leading term of $H_i^{\mathrm{JMMS},\infty}$. Similarly, this suggests that the restriction to $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}}$ of the leading term of (18) should be stricly related with the PBW quantisation of the quadratic term of $H_j^{\mathrm{JMMS},0}$, as it reduces to DMT when $m = 1$. Replacing again $\mu = T^0, \mu' = \partial_{t_j^0}$ for $1 \leq j \leq l$, one has:

$$\sum_{\alpha>0} \frac{\langle \alpha, \mu'\rangle}{\langle \alpha, \mu\rangle} \widehat{e}_\alpha \cdot \widehat{f}_\alpha = \sum_{1\leq i,n\leq m} \sum_{k>l} \frac{\langle \alpha_{kl}, e_{jj}\rangle}{\langle \alpha_{kl}, T^0\rangle} \widehat{e}_{kl}^{(i)} \cdot \widehat{e}_{lk}^{(n)} =$$

$$= \sum_{i,n}\sum_{j>l} \frac{\langle \alpha_{jl}, e_{jj}\rangle}{\langle \alpha_{jl}, T^0\rangle} \widehat{e}_{jl}^{(i)} \cdot \widehat{e}_{lj}^{(n)} + \sum_{i,n}\sum_{k>j} \frac{\langle \alpha_{kj}, e_{jj}\rangle}{\langle \alpha_{kj}, T^0\rangle} \widehat{e}_{kj}^{(i)} \cdot \widehat{e}_{jk}^{(n)} =$$

$$= \sum_{i,n}\sum_{j>l} \frac{\widehat{e}_{jl}^{(i)} \cdot \widehat{e}_{lj}^{(n)}}{t_j^0 - t_l^0} - \sum_{i,n}\sum_{k>j} \frac{\widehat{e}_{kj}^{(i)} \cdot \widehat{e}_{jk}^{(n)}}{t_k^0 - t_j^0} = \sum_{i,n}\sum_{k\neq j} \frac{\widehat{e}_{jk}^{(i)} \cdot \widehat{e}_{kj}^{(n)}}{t_j^0 - t_k^0}.$$

Here one used $\langle \alpha_{kl}, e_{jj}\rangle = \delta_{kj} - \delta_{lj}$ and $\langle \alpha_{kl}, T^0\rangle = t_k^0 - t_l^0$. Also, the choice $\{\alpha_{kl}\}_{k>l}$ of positive roots has been made. This sum is not quite the PBW quantisation of the quadratic term of $H_j^{\mathrm{JMMS},0}$, which rather equals:

$$\mathcal{Q}\left(\sum_{i,n}\sum_{j\neq k} \frac{(R_i)_{jk}(R_n)_{kj}}{t_j^0 - t_k^0}\right) = \sum_{i,n}\sum_{j\neq k} \frac{1}{2(t_j^0 - t_k^0)} \left(\widehat{e}_{jk}^{(i)} \cdot \widehat{e}_{kj}^{(n)} + \widehat{e}_{kj}^{(n)} \cdot \widehat{e}_{jk}^{(i)}\right) =$$

$$= \sum_{i,n}\sum_{j\neq k} \frac{\widehat{e}_{jk}^{(i)} \cdot \widehat{e}_{kj}^{(n)}}{t_j^0 - t_k^0} + \sum_i \sum_{j\neq k} \frac{\widehat{e}_{kk}^{(i)} - \widehat{e}_{jj}^{(i)}}{2(t_j^0 - t_k^0)}.$$

This formula is obtained by remarking that $\big[\widehat{e}^{(i)}_{kj}, \widehat{e}^{(n)}_{jk}\big] = \delta_{in}\big(\widehat{e}^{(i)}_{kk} - \widehat{e}^{(i)}_{jj}\big)$ as elements of $U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}$. This means that the difference

$$\left(\widehat{H}^{\mathrm{FMTV},II}_j\Big|_{\mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}}\times \mathrm{Conf}_m(\mathbb{C})}\right) - \mathcal{Q}\big(H^{\mathrm{JMMS},0}_j\big) : \mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{reg}} \times \mathrm{Conf}_m(\mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}$$

is an operator of order one, when evaluated at a point of the restricted JMMS base. Hence the restricted FMTV Hamiltonian has the same semiclassical limit as $\mathcal{Q}\big(H^{\mathrm{JMMS},0}_j\big)$, which is by definition the JMMS Hamiltonian for the irregular time t^0_j. □

Finally, one can make sense of the statement that the DMT connection (12) is a variation of the FMTV connection. Indeed, by taking $m = 1$ in the Hamiltonian $\widehat{H}^{\mathrm{FMTV},II}_j$, and picking $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}_l(\mathbb{C})$, one finds

$$\widehat{H}^{\mathrm{FMTV},II}_j = \sum_{k\neq j} \frac{\widehat{e}_{jk}\cdot\widehat{e}_{kj}}{t^0_j - t^0_k},$$

for $1 \leq j \leq l$. Now there is no need for superscripts, because one has only one residue. The analogous Hamiltonian of the DMT system is

$$\widehat{H}^{\mathrm{DMT}}_j = \sum_{k\neq j} \frac{\widehat{e}_{jk}\cdot\widehat{e}_{kj} + \widehat{e}_{kj}\cdot\widehat{e}_{jk}}{2(t^0_j - t^0_k)} = \sum_{k\neq j} \frac{\widehat{e}_{jk}\cdot\widehat{e}_{kj}}{t^0_j - t^0_k} + \sum_{k\neq j} \frac{\big[\widehat{e}_{kj}, \widehat{e}_{jk}\big]}{2(t^0_j - t^0_k)} = \widehat{H}^{\mathrm{FMTV},II}_j + \sum_{k\neq j} \frac{\widehat{e}_{kk} - \widehat{e}_{jj}}{2(t^0_j - t^0_k)}.$$

This difference is indeed coherent with the fact that DMT is the PBW quantisation of the dual Schlesinger system, i.e. of the JMMS Hamiltonian $H^{\mathrm{JMMS},0}_j$. Indeed, the proof of Prop. 40 shows that one must correct FMTV in order to get to the PBW quantisation of JMMS. Moreover, this difference is totally analogous to the difference between the simply-laced quantum connection and DMT. One thus has three different flat connections quantising the same classical system.

As a final remark, let us mention the cycle-theoretic interpretation of the difference between FMTV and the PBW quantisation of JMMS. Namely, the sum

$$\sum_{j\neq k} \widehat{e}^{(i)}_{jk}\cdot\widehat{e}^{(n)}_{kj} \in U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m}$$

will expand in the Weyl algebra (via the quantum moment $\widehat{\mu}^*_0 : U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m} \longrightarrow W(\mathbb{M}, \omega_a)$ as in § 10.6) as the trace of a quantum 4-cycle through the nodes $i, n \in I^\infty$ and $j \neq k \in I^0$. More precisely, the expansion yields a quantum 4-cycle, which is an addend of the quantum potential for the simply-laced quantum Hamiltonian $\widehat{H}^0_j$. Now, the condition $i \neq n$ means that the cycle is nondegenerate, whereas $i = n$ makes it degenerate. It is only on degenerate 4-cycles that one must make a choice of ordering, and one basically has to either pick an anchor or to consider some symmetrisation. In this article made the first choice, because the symmetrisation seems to tamper with the flatness for more general quivers. This is thus more in line with the definition of the FMTV connection. The DMT connection, on the other way, considered a symmetric quantisation, and this is possibly one way of explaining the footnote on page 3 of [MTL05] (it states that the Casimir connection is equivariant with respect to the action of the Weyl group, whereas the dynamical connection is not).

12.4. **The quantum reduction.**

What is left is putting together the results of § 10.6, § 10.7 and § 11.5 to show that a correction of (15) reduces to FMTV when $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}_l(\mathbb{C})$. In the proof of Prop. 40 we provided the explicit formulas:

$$\widehat{H}_i^{\mathrm{FMTV},I} = \sum_{i\neq k,j,l} \frac{\widehat{e}_{jl}^{(i)} \cdot \widehat{e}_{lj}^{(k)}}{t_i^\infty - t_k^\infty} + \sum_j t_j^0 \widehat{e}_{jj}^{(i)},$$

$$\widehat{H}_j^{\mathrm{FMTV},II} = \sum_{k\neq j,i,l} \frac{\widehat{e}_{jk}^{(i)} \cdot \widehat{e}_{kj}^{(l)}}{t_j^0 - t_k^0} + \sum_i t_i^\infty \widehat{e}_{jj}^{(i)}.$$

As argued in the aforementioned sections, the change of variable $(\widehat{R}_i)_{jk} = \widehat{Q}_{ji}\widehat{P}_{ik}$ amounts to applying the quantum (co)moment $\widehat{\mu}_0^* : U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes m} \longrightarrow A = W(\mathbb{M}, \omega_a)$. Doing this, one finds the following A-valued quantum Hamiltonians:

$$\widehat{H'}_i^\infty = \sum_{i\neq k,j,l} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_{ji}\widehat{P}_{il}\widehat{Q}_{lk}\widehat{P}_{kj})}{t_i^\infty - t_k^\infty} + \sum_j t_j^0 \,\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_{ji}\widehat{P}_{ij}),$$

$$\widehat{H'}_j^0 = \sum_{k\neq j,i,l} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_{ji}\widehat{P}_{ik}\widehat{Q}_{kl}\widehat{P}_{lj})}{t_j^0 - t_k^0} + \sum_i t_i^\infty \,\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{Q}_{ji}\widehat{P}_{ij}).$$

This produces a new connection

$$\widehat{\nabla}' := d_{\mathbf{B}} - \sum_{i\in I^\infty} \widehat{H'}_i^\infty dt_i^\infty - \sum_{j\in I^0} \widehat{H'}_j^0 dt_j^0,$$

in the trivial vector bundle $\mathbb{E}_a = A \times \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$. This connection is again obtained by the SLQC via a change of anchors, so to write all operators as traces of quantum cycles based at nodes in the part $I^0 \subseteq I$, because such a cycle can be interpreted as a residue. Moreover, the correction is negligible in the semiclassical limit.

Proposition 41. *The A-valued one-form $\widehat{\nabla} - \widehat{\nabla}' \in \Omega^1(\mathbf{B}, A)$ vanishes in the semiclassical limit.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of Prop. 34. One can compute explicitly the differences $\langle \widehat{\nabla} - \widehat{\nabla}', \partial_{t_i^\infty} \rangle = \widehat{H'}_i^\infty - \widehat{H}_i^\infty$ and $\langle \widehat{\nabla} - \widehat{\nabla}', \partial_{t_j^0} \rangle = \widehat{H'}_j^0 - \widehat{H}_j^0$ for all i, j, using $\left[\widehat{Q}_{ji}, \widehat{P}_{ij}\right] = 1$. The difference of these operators of order four is an operator of order strictly less than four. Hence they have the same principal symbol, i.e. the same semiclassical limit. □

It is not relevant here, but the corrected connection might still be flat. The general proposition 10 can still be used to test this. Notice however that $\widehat{\nabla}'$ is less symmetric than the simply-laced quantum connection, because now on top of the classical nontrivial intersection of a nondegenerate 4-cycle with a degenerate one there are a priori different quantum intersections (this is the case 6 of § 9.1). Hence more minute verifications than those of § 9.1 are required. This phenomenon is another motivation for the definition of the simply-laced quantum connection.

13. Comparison with Nagoya–Sun.

As a last comparison, we consider the isomonodromy systems of [JMU81]. They developed a theory of monodromy preserving deformations of systems of differential equations of the form:

$$\frac{dY}{dz} = A(z)Y(z), \qquad \text{where} \qquad A(z) = \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{l=0}^{r_i} \frac{A_{i,-l}}{(z-a_i)^{l+1}} - \sum_{l=1}^{r_\infty} A_{\infty,-l} z^{l-1},$$

such that the leading coefficient at each irregular pole has distinct eigenvalues. Here z is a local holomorphic coordinate on $\mathbb{C}P^1$ that identifies $\mathbb{C}P^1 \cong \mathbb{C}\coprod\{\infty\}$, and $Y = Y(z), A_{i,-l}, A_{\infty,-l} \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ are matrices of size $n > 0$ for all i, l. Next, $\{a_i\}_i \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is a collection of m distinct points (with $a_\infty = \infty$ implied) and $r_i, r_\infty \geq 0$ are integers for all i. If $r_i > 0$ then one has an irregular singularity at a_i of Poincaré rank r_i, for $i \in \{1, \dots, m, \infty\}$. If instead $r_i = 0$ then one has a regular singularity. One further assumes $A_{i,-r_i}$ to have distinct eigenvalues (modulo integers, if $r_i = 0$).

The intersection of those systems with the SLIMS of [Boa12] is obtained by taking $r_i = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $r_\infty = 2$. Indeed, by replacing $A_{i,0}, a_i, A_{\infty,-1}, A_{\infty,-2}$ with $-Q_iP_i, t_i^\infty, B+T, A$, respectively, then the above system reduces to

$$\frac{dY}{dz} = -\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{Q_iP_i}{z - t_i^\infty} + (B+T) + Az\right) Y(z),$$

which is equivalent to considering the meromorphic connection

$$\nabla = d - \mathcal{A} = d - \big(Az + (B+T) + Q(z - T^\infty)^{-1}P\big)dz$$

on a trivial vector bundle $U^\infty \times \mathbb{C}P^1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}P^1$, as in § 3. The difference is that now one considers nonresonant residues, and more importantly the diagonal matrix $A = \mathrm{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ is regular. This means taking a degenerate reading of a complete $k+1$-partite graph $\mathcal{G}$ such that only the part corresponding to ∞ is splayed in $|I^\infty| = m$ nodes, and to all other parts one attaches vector spaces W^j of dimension one.

Now, the theory of [JMU81] allows one to consider the pole positions t_i^∞ and the diagonal matrices T, A as independent deformation parameters (see eq. 4.2 of [JMU81] and the remark thereafter[13]). This falls out of the present scope, where the highest irregular type A is not varied in order to enable for an explicit description of the isomonodromy Hamiltonians for the remaining deformation parameters T, T^∞. One is after these explicit formulations because they provide quite straightforward quantisation: this is one of the main points of this article. The general proof that the deformation equations are symplectic can be found in [Boa01], but a general Hamiltonian theory hasn't been written down yet.

In [NS11] one finds explicit functions associated to the deformations of T, A and T^∞. Namely, one takes a variation of the Schlesinger Hamiltonians for the deformation of the pole positions. For the other parameters, one writes

$$\omega = \omega^{(1)} + \omega^{(2)} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} H_i^{(1)} dt_i + H_i^{(2)} da_i,$$

[13] One should replace $a_i, T^\infty_{-1}, T^\infty_{-2}$ with t_i^∞, T, A, respectively.

for suitable functions $H_i^{(1)}, H_i^{(2)}$.[14] Then eq. 3.11 and 3.12 of [NS11] provide an explicit expansion of the one-form ω.

The most interesting comparison to make is that of $H_i^{(1)}$ and H_i, for $1 \leq i \leq k$, since the results of § 10 and § 12 prove that the simply-laced quantum Hamiltonians can recover the KZ connection when moving the regular times t_i^∞. Now, looking at the aforementioned eq. 3.11, one sees indeed expansions of traces of cycles in $\mathcal{G}$, in terms of the entries of the matrices B, R_i. If one writes the first addend of $\langle \omega^{(1)}, \partial_{t_i} \rangle$, then one recognises the sum of all three cycles in $\mathcal{G}$ starting at the node i, with suitable weights.[15] The rest of the formula yields a weighted sum of traces of 2-cycles through the node i. There are no 4-cycles as it is expected in the general setup of the SLIMS. Finally, notice that eq. 3.12 has the same overall structure: each of its addend is the trace of a certain potential on $\mathcal{G}$, and now one also finds 4-cycles.

All this seems to indicate that the cycle-theoretic viewpoint of this article provides a conceptual framework that simplifies part of the exposition of [NS11], and that moreover this approach could be extended to the full Hamiltonian system at the intersection of [JMU81] and [Boa12].

As far as quantisation is concerned, in [NS11] one fixes an order for the variables appearing in the classical system, and then systematically replaces them with operators acting on modules for a certain quantum algebra (those are the confluent Verma modules, defined in [JNS08] for $\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$). The choice of an order is noncanonical, and in our setting it amounts to fix an orientation for the quiver. In this way one defines operators $\mathcal{H}_i^{(1)}, \mathcal{H}_i^{(2)}$, so that $\mathcal{H}_i^{(1)}$ is associated to the time t_i, and $\mathcal{H}_i^{(2)}$ to a_i. Example 3.3. on page 9 provides an expansion of these operators when there are no simple poles, in the case of rank $k = 3$. In our setting, this means passing to the generic reading of a triangle where all nodes have dimension one. Again, the most meaningful comparison to make is that of $\mathcal{H}_i^{(1)}$ and the quantum Hamiltonian $\widehat{H}_i$ 7.2, where $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. To write down the simply-laced quantum Hamiltonians, call $1, 2, 3$ the nodes of the triangle, and write arrows as $\alpha := (1, 2), \beta := (2, 3), \gamma := (3, 1)$. Then

$$\widehat{H}_1 = c_1 \operatorname{Tr}(\gamma\beta\underline{\alpha}) + c_2 \operatorname{Tr}(\alpha^*\beta^*\underline{\gamma^*}) + c_3 \operatorname{Tr}(\alpha^*\underline{\alpha}) + c_4 \operatorname{Tr}(\gamma\underline{\gamma^*}) + c_5,$$

where the weights $c_1, \ldots, c_4$ depend on the reading $a : \{1, 2, 3\} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}P^1$, and c_5 is a function used to commute the arrows of the 2-cycles. To make things more explicit, one chooses an orientation for the triangle, by saying that the arrow (i, j) is positive if $i < j$. Then one has the splitting

$$\mathbb{M} = \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq 3} \operatorname{Hom}(W^i, W^j) \cong T^* \left(\bigoplus_{1 \leq i < j \leq 3} \operatorname{Hom}(W^i, W^j) \right),$$

for which the arrows α, β, γ now correspond to the position variables q_{12}, q_{23}, p_{31}, and their opposite to the momenta variable p_{21}, p_{32}, p_{13}:

$$\omega_{\text{can}} = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq 3} dq_{ij} \wedge dp_{ji}.$$

[14] It is not entirely clear to us how to interpret the functions $H_i^{(2)}$ as time-dependent Hamiltonians (cf. Rmk. 7.1 of [Boa01]).

[15] The matrix B_1 of [NS11] correspond to our B, the matrix B_0 to the sum $\sum_i Q_i P_i$ of residues, and B_{-1} is the sum $\sum_i Q_i P_i t_i^\infty$. Finally, the highest irregular times $t_i^{(2)}$ now become our diagonal entries a_i.

One can now let $\widehat{H}_1 : \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow W(\mathbb{M}, \omega_a)$ act on the space of polynomials $\mathbb{C}[q]$ in the position variables, by means of $\widehat{q}_{ij} := \mu_{q_{ij}}$ (multiplication operator) and $\widehat{p}_{ji} := -\partial_{q_{ij}}$, so that:

$$\widehat{H}_1 = c'_1 q_{31} q_{23} q_{12} + c'_2(\partial_{q_{12}} \partial_{q_{23}} \partial_{q_{31}}) + c'_3 \partial_{q_{12}} q_{12} + c'_4 q_{13} \partial_{q_{13}} + c'_5$$

Ignoring the order-zero operator c'_5, this formula is an analogue of that of $\mathcal{H}_1^{(1)}$ in example 3.3 of [NS11], which seems to indicate that the two viewpoints are compatible.

14. Appendix

Here we provide all the left-out proofs of the propositions in the body of the article, after briefly recalling the relevant statements.

Proof of Prop. 3.

Proposition. *One has*

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left\{C_1, C_2\right\} = \{\mathrm{Tr}(C_1), \mathrm{Tr}(C_2)\} \in A_0$$

for all cycles $C_1, C_2 \in \mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}$.

Proof. To simplify the notation, introduce multi-indices $K := (k_n, \ldots, k_1), L := (l_m, \ldots, l_1)$ that vary respectively in

$$D_{C_1} := \{1, \ldots, d_{h(\alpha_n)}\} \times \cdots \times \{1, \ldots, d_{h(\alpha_1)}\} \quad \text{and} \quad D_{C_2} := \{1, \ldots, d_{h(\beta_m)}\} \times \cdots \times \{1, \ldots, d_{h(\beta_1)}\}.$$

After evaluating at a representation, one gets:

$$\{\mathrm{Tr}(\rho^{C_1}), \mathrm{Tr}(\rho^{C_2})\} = \sum_{K \in D_{C_1}, L \in D_{C_2}} \left\{X^{\alpha_n}_{k_n,k_{n-1}} \ldots X^{\alpha_1}_{k_1,k_n}, X^{\beta_m}_{l_m,l_{m-1}} \ldots X^{\beta_1}_{l_1,l_m}\right\} =$$

$$= \sum_{K,L,1\le i\le n,1\le j\le m} \left\{X^{\alpha_i}_{k_i,k_{i-1}}, X^{\beta_j}_{l_j,l_{j-1}}\right\} X^{\alpha_n}_{k_n,k_{n-1}} \ldots \widehat{X^{\alpha_i}_{k_i,k_{i-1}}} \ldots X^{\alpha_1}_{k_1,k_n} \cdot X^{\beta_m}_{l_m,l_{m-1}} \ldots \widehat{X^{\beta_j}_{l_j,l_{j-1}}} \ldots X^{\beta_1}_{l_1,l_m} =$$

$$= \sum_{K,L,i,j:\alpha_i=\beta_j^*} c_{ij} \delta_{k_i,l_{j-1}} \delta_{k_{i-1},l_j} X^{\alpha_n}_{k_n,k_{n-1}} \ldots \widehat{X^{\alpha_i}_{k_i,k_{i-1}}} \ldots X^{\alpha_1}_{k_1,k_n} \cdot X^{\beta_m}_{l_m,l_{m-1}} \ldots \widehat{X^{\beta_j}_{l_j,l_{j-1}}} \ldots X^{\beta_1}_{l_1,l_m} =$$

$$= \sum_{K,L,i,j:\alpha_i=\beta_j^*} c_{ij} X^{\alpha_{i-1}}_{k_{i-1},i-2} \ldots X^{\alpha_1}_{k_1,k_n} X^{\alpha_n}_{k_n,k_{n-1}} \ldots X^{\alpha_{i+1}}_{k_{i+1},k_i} \cdot X^{\beta_{j-1}}_{k_i,l_{j-2}} \ldots X^{\beta_1}_{l_1,l_m} X^{\beta_m}_{l_m,l_{m-1}} \ldots X^{\beta_{j+1}}_{l_{j+1},k_{i-1}} =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j:\alpha_i=\beta_j^*} c_{ij}\, \mathrm{Tr}(X^{\beta_m} \ldots X^{\beta_{j+1}} \cdot X^{\alpha_{i-1}} \ldots X^{\alpha_1} X^{\alpha_n} \ldots X^{\alpha_{i+1}} \cdot X^{\beta_{j-1}} \ldots X^{\beta_1}).$$

Here a hat denotes an arrow that has been left out, and one used

$$\left\{X^{\alpha_i}_{k_i,k_{i-1}}, X^{\beta_j}_{l_j,l_{j-1}}\right\} = c_{ij} \delta_{k_i,l_{j-1}} \delta_{k_{i-1},l_j} \in \mathbb{C}\,.$$

Notice that $\alpha_i = \beta_j^*$ implies $t(\alpha_{i+1}) = h(\beta_{j-1})$ and $h(\alpha_{i-1}) = t(\beta_{j+1})$. Hence the compositions $X^{\alpha_{i+1}} \cdot X^{\beta_{j-1}}$ and $X^{\beta_{j+1}} \cdot X^{\alpha_{i-1}}$ make sense. □

Proof of Prop. 7.

We will prove the following more precise statement, which immediately yields Prop. 7.

Proposition. *Pick a quantum cycle* $\widehat{C} = \alpha_n \dots \underline{\alpha_1}$*, and let* $\widehat{C}' = \alpha_j \dots \alpha_1 \alpha_n \dots \underline{\alpha_{j+1}}$ *be a change of anchoring. One has*

$$\widehat{C} - \widehat{C}' = \sum_{1 \leq l \leq j} \sum_{\alpha_m = \alpha_l^*} c_{lm} \widehat{C}_{lm} \widehat{D}_{lm}$$

where $\widehat{C}_{lm}, \widehat{D}_{lm}$ *are two quantum cycle obtained by deleting the arrows* $\alpha_k, \alpha_l = \alpha_k^*$*, and where* $c_{lm} \in \mathbb{C}$ *is the usual structure constant coming from* ω_a*.*

Proof. First, notice that one has a telescopic sum:

$$\widehat{C} - \widehat{C}' = \sum_{0 \leq l \leq j-1} \big(\alpha_l \dots \alpha_1 \alpha_n \dots \underline{\alpha_{l+1}} - \alpha_{l+1} \dots \alpha_1 \alpha_n \dots \underline{\alpha_{l+2}} \big),$$

so that the problem reduces to make one arrow commute.
Now pick traces and compute, introducing again the multi-index K associated to $C = \sigma(\widehat{C}) = \sigma(\widehat{C}')$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{Tr}\big(\alpha_l \dots \alpha_1 \alpha_n \dots \underline{\alpha_{l+1}} - \alpha_{l+1} \dots \alpha_1 \alpha_n \dots \underline{\alpha_{l+2}} \big) = \\
&= \sum_{K \in D_C} \widehat{X}^{\alpha_l}_{k_l,k_{l-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_1}_{k_1,k_n} \widehat{X}^{\alpha_n}_{k_n,k_{n-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{l+1}}_{k_{l+1},k_l} - \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{l+1}}_{k_{l+1},k_l} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_1}_{k_1,k_n} \widehat{X}^{\alpha_n}_{k_n,k_{n-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{l+2}}_{k_{l+2},k_{l+1}} = \\
&= \sum_{K \in D_C} \big[\widehat{X}^{\alpha_l}_{k_l,k_{l-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_1}_{k_1,k_n} \widehat{X}^{\alpha_n}_{k_n,k_{n-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{l+2}}_{k_{l+2},k_{l+1}}, \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{l+1}}_{k_{l+1},k_{l+2}} \big] = \\
&= \sum_{K \in D_C} \sum_{\alpha_m = \alpha_{l+1}^*} \widehat{X}^{\alpha_l}_{k_l,k_{l-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{m+1}}_{k_{m+1},k_m} \big[\widehat{X}^{\alpha_m}_{k_m,k_{m-1}}, \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{l+1}}_{k_{l+1},k_l} \big] \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{m-1}}_{k_{m-1},k_{m-2}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{l+2}}_{k_{l+2},k_{l+1}} = \\
&= \sum_{K \in D_C} \sum_{\alpha_m = \alpha_{l+1}^*} \big(c_{m,l+1} \delta_{k_l,k_m} \delta_{k_{m-1},k_{l+1}} \big) \widehat{X}^{\alpha_l}_{k_l,k_{l-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{m+1}}_{k_{m+1},k_m} \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{m-1}}_{k_{m-1},k_{m-2}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{l+2}}_{k_{l+2},k_{l+1}} = \\
&= \sum_{K'} \sum_{\alpha_m = \alpha_{l+1}^*} c_{m,l+1} \widehat{X}^{\alpha_l}_{k_m,k_{l-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{m+1}}_{k_{m+1},k_m} \cdot \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{m-1}}_{k_{m-1},k_{m-2}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{l+2}}_{k_{l+2},k_{m-1}} = \\
&= \sum_{\alpha_m = \alpha_{l+1}^*} c_{m,l+1} \operatorname{Tr}(\alpha_l \dots \underline{\alpha_{m+1}}) \operatorname{Tr}(\alpha_{m-1} \dots \underline{\alpha_{l+2}}) =: \sum_{\alpha_m = \alpha_{l+1}^*} c_{m,l+1} \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{C}_{m,l+1}) \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{D}_{m,l+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

The last identity defines the cycles $\widehat{C}_{m,l+1}$ and $\widehat{D}_{m,l+1}$. Also, we used

$$c_{m,l+1} \delta_{k_l,k_m} \delta_{k_{m-1},k_{l+1}} = \big[\widehat{X}^{\alpha_m}_{k_m,k_{m-1}}, \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{l+1}}_{k_{l+1},k_l} \big] \in \mathbb{C}\,.$$

Now, by definition, the above computation yields

$$\alpha_l \dots \alpha_1 \alpha_n \dots \underline{\alpha_{l+1}} - \alpha_{l+1} \dots \alpha_1 \alpha_n \dots \underline{\alpha_{l+2}} = \sum_{\alpha_m = \alpha_{l+1}^*} c_{m,l+1} \widehat{C}_{m,l+1} \widehat{D}_{m,l+1},$$

and summing on $l \in \{0, \dots, j-1\}$ gives the conclusion. □

Proof of lem. 11.

Lemma. *Pick two quantum cycles* $\widehat{C}_1, \widehat{C}_2$*, with underlying classical cycles* C_1, C_2*. Assume that one of* $\widehat{C}_1, \widehat{C}_2$ *is a 2-cycle, or that one of them does not contain antiparallel arrows. Then Prop. 10 holds for* $\big[\widehat{C}_1, \widehat{C}_2\big] \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}\,\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cycl}}}$*.*

Proof. Write $\widehat{C}_1 = \alpha_n \dots \underline{\alpha_1}, \widehat{C}_2 = \beta_m \dots \underline{\beta_1}$, for $\alpha_i, \beta_j \in \mathcal{G}_1$, and introduce again multi-indices $K := (k_n, \dots, k_1), L := (l_m, \dots, l_1)$ varying respectively in

$$D_{C_1} := \{1, \dots, d_{h(\alpha_n)}\} \times \cdots \times \{1, \dots, d_{h(\alpha_1)}\} \quad \text{and} \quad D_{C_2} := \{1, \dots, d_{h(\beta_m)}\} \times \cdots \times \{1, \dots, d_{h(\beta_1)}\}.$$

The notation is correct: the multi-indices only depend on the underlying classical cycles. Now, one wants to expand

$$\big[\operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{C}_1), \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{C}_2)\big] = \sum_{K \in D_{C_1}, L \in D_{C_2}} \big[\widehat{X}^{\alpha_n}_{k_n,k_{n-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_1}_{k_1,k_n}, \widehat{X}^{\beta_m}_{l_m,l_{m-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\beta_1}_{l_1,l_m}\big].$$

By applying Leibnitz rule recursively, one finds two possible developments:

$$\begin{aligned}\big[\operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{C}_1), \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{C}_2)\big] = &\sum_{K \in D_{C_1}, L \in D_{C_2}} \sum_{i,j:\alpha_i = \beta_j^*} [\widehat{X}^{\alpha_i}_{k_i,k_{i-1}}, \widehat{X}^{\beta_j}_{l_j,l_{j-1}}] \widehat{X}^{\beta_m}_{l_m,l_{m-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\beta_{j+1}}_{l_{j+1},l_j} \cdot \\ &\cdot \widehat{X}^{\alpha_n}_{k_n,k_{n-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{i+1}}_{k_{i+1},k_i} \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{i-1}}_{k_{i-1},k_{i-2}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_1}_{k_1,k_n} \cdot \widehat{X}^{\beta_{j-1}}_{l_{j-1},l_{j-2}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\beta_1}_{l_1,l_m} = \\ = &\sum_{K \in D_{C_1}, L \in D_{C_2}} \sum_{i,j:\alpha_i = \beta_j^*} [\widehat{X}^{\alpha_i}_{k_i,k_{i-1}}, \widehat{X}^{\beta_j}_{l_j,l_{j-1}}] \widehat{X}^{\alpha_n}_{k_m,k_{n-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{i+1}}_{k_{i+1},k_i} \cdot \\ &\cdot \widehat{X}^{\beta_m}_{l_m,l_{m-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\beta_{j+1}}_{l_{j+1},l_j} \widehat{X}^{\beta_{j-1}}_{l_{j-1},l_{j-2}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\beta_1}_{l_1,l_m} \cdot \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{i-1}}_{k_{i-1},k_{i-2}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_1}_{k_1,k_n}\end{aligned}$$

Here we could displace all commutators of variables on the left, since they're just constants lying in the centre of A.

Now, one would like to write all the words of length $n+m-2$ in the sum as traces of quantum cycles. One consistent way to ensure this is precisely the condition given in the statement. Indeed, if - say - $\widehat{C}_1$ satisfies the hypothesis, then it has no pair of antiparallel arrows, as soon as one of its arrows is removed. Then one is free to write

$$\widehat{X}^{\alpha_n}_{k_n,k_{n-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{i+1}}_{k_{i+1},k_i} \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{i-1}}_{k_{i-1},k_{i-2}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_1}_{k_1,k_n} = \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{i-1}}_{k_{i-1},k_{i-2}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_1}_{k_1,k_n} \widehat{X}^{\alpha_n}_{k_n,k_{n-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{i+1}}_{k_{i+1},k_i}$$

and thus all addends get the desired form:

$$\begin{aligned}\big[\operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{C}_1), \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{C}_2)\big] = &\sum_{K \in D_{C_1}, L \in D_{C_2}} \sum_{i,j:\alpha_i = \beta_j^*} [\widehat{X}^{\alpha_i}_{k_i,k_{i-1}}, \widehat{X}^{\beta_j}_{l_j,l_{j-1}}] \widehat{X}^{\beta_m}_{l_m,l_{m-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\beta_{j+1}}_{l_{j+1},l_j} \cdot \\ &\cdot \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{i-1}}_{k_{i-1},k_{i-2}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_1}_{k_1,k_n} \widehat{X}^{\alpha_n}_{k_n,k_{n-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{i+1}}_{k_{i+1},k_i} \cdot \widehat{X}^{\beta_{j-1}}_{l_{j-1},l_{j-2}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\beta_1}_{l_1,l_m} = \\ = &\sum_{i,j:\alpha_i = \beta_j^*} c_{ij} \operatorname{Tr}\big(\widehat{X}^{\beta_m} \dots \widehat{X}^{\beta_{j+1}} \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{i-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_1} \widehat{X}^{\alpha_n} \dots \widehat{X}^{\alpha_{i+1}} \widehat{X}^{\beta_{j-1}} \dots \widehat{X}^{\beta_1}\big),\end{aligned}$$

where we used $[\widehat{X}^{\alpha_i}_{k_i,k_{i-1}}, \widehat{X}^{\beta_j}_{l_j,l_{j-1}}] = c_{ij} \delta_{k_i,l_{j-1}} \delta_{k_{i-1},l_j} \in \mathbb{C}$. This is the same structure constant as in the classical case, precisely because A is a quantisation of A_0. Notice that the second development would work if $\widehat{C}_2$ were the quantum cycle satisfying the hypothesis.

Comparing the above formula with that of $\{C_1, C_2\} = \sigma\big([\widehat{C}_1, \widehat{C}_2]\big)$ shows that the commutator is the trivial lift of the Poisson bracket. □

Further verifications for Prop. 10.

Proposition. *Pick nodes $a, b, c, d \in I$ such that the sequences of nodes (a, b, a, c) and (a, c, d, c) define two degenerate 4-cycles. Then the following commutator vanishes:*



Proof. Let's set $\alpha := (a,b), \beta := (b,c), \gamma := (c,d)$. Then one has:

$$\Big[Tr(\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}\widehat{X}^{\beta}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}, \widehat{X}^{\beta}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}\widehat{X}^{\gamma})\Big] = \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} \Big[\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}, \widehat{X}^{\beta}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{pm}\Big] =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} \Big[\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{jk}, \widehat{X}^{\beta}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{no}\Big]\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{pm} =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} \widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{mn}\Big[\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{jk}, \widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{no}\Big]\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{pm} + \Big[\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{ij}, \widehat{X}^{\beta}_{mn}\Big]\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{pm} =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} c_{\beta\beta^*}\delta_{jo}\delta_{kn}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{pm} + c_{\beta^*\beta}\delta_{jm}\delta_{in}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{pm} =$$

$$= c_{\beta\beta^*}\Big(\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}\widehat{X}^{\beta}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}\widehat{X}^{\alpha} - \mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}\widehat{X}^{\beta}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}\widehat{X}^{\alpha})\Big) = 0.$$

One uses that $c_{\beta\beta^*} \in \mathbb{C}$ is alternating in the arrows of $\mathcal{G}$. □

Proposition. *Pick two degenerate 4-cycles with the central node $j \in I$ in common. If they intersect nontrivially, then one has, ignoring structure constants:*



Proof. Denote β, β^* the arrows that the two cycle have in common, with $t(\beta) = j$. Set then α, α^* to be the remaining arrows of the leftmost cycle, with $t(\alpha) = j$, and similarly

for γ, γ^*, where $t(\gamma) = j$. Then one has:

$$\Big[\operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}\widehat{X}^{\beta}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}), \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}\widehat{X}^{\beta}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}\widehat{X}^{\gamma})\Big] = \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} [\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}, \widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{pm}] =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} [\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{jk}, \widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{no}]\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{pm} =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} \widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{ij}[\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{jk}, \widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{mn}]\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{pm} + \widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{mn}[\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{ij}, \widehat{X}^{\beta}_{no}]\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{pm} =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} c_{\beta\beta^*}\delta_{jn}\delta_{km}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{pm} + c_{\beta^*\beta}\delta_{io}\delta_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{pm} =$$

$$= c_{\beta\beta^*}\Big(\operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}\widehat{X}^{\beta}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}) - \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}\widehat{X}^{\beta}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}\widehat{X}^{\gamma})\Big),$$

□

Final verifications for Thm. 8.

Proposition. *Pick nodes $a, b, c, d \in I$ so that (a, d, c) defines a 3-cycle. Assume also that a and b are adjacent. Then one may choose Darboux coordinates so that:*



Proof. Set $\alpha := (a, d), \beta := (d, c), \gamma := (c, a)$ and $\varepsilon := (a, b)$. Then one has:

$$\big[\operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon^*}\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}), \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\gamma}\widehat{X}^{\beta}\widehat{X}^{\alpha})\big] = \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o} [\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon^*}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}_{li}, \widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{om}] =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o} \widehat{X}^{\varepsilon^*}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{kl}[\widehat{X}^{\gamma^*}_{li}, \widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{mn}]\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{om} =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o} \delta_{ln}\delta_{im}\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon^*}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{om} = \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon^*}\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}\widehat{X}^{\beta}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}).$$

□

Proposition. *Pick nodes $a, b, c, d \in I$ defining a 4-cycle. Assume that a and c are adjacent. Then one may choose Darboux coordinates so that:*



Proof. Set $\alpha := (a,b), \beta = (b,c), \gamma := (c,d), \varepsilon := (d,a), \zeta := (a,c)$. Then one has:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big[\operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}\widehat{X}^{\beta}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}), \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}\widehat{X}^{\zeta})\big] = \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o} \big[\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}, \widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}_{om}\big] = \\
&= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o} \widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}\big[\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}, \widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{no}\big]\widehat{X}^{\zeta}_{om} + \widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\big[\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}, \widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{no}\big]\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}_{om} = \\
&= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o} \delta_{ln}\delta_{im}\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}_{om} + \delta_{ko}\delta_{ln}\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}_{om} = \\
&= \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}\widehat{X}^{\beta}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}) + \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition. *Pick nodes $a,b,c,d \in I$ defining a 4-cycle. One may choose Darboux coordinates so that:*



On the right-hand side one splits the nodes b, c to indicate the order in which to follow the 6-cycle: the 2-cycle comes first, the nondegenerate 4-cycle comes last.

Proof. Let's denote $\alpha := (a,b), \beta := (b,c), \gamma := (c,d)$, and $\varepsilon = (d,a)$. Then one has:

$$\Big[\operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}\widehat{X}^{\beta}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}), \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\alpha}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}\widehat{X}^{\beta})\Big] = \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} \Big[\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}, \widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{pm}\Big] =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} \widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}\Big[\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}, \widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{pm}\Big] + \widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\Big[\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}, \widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{pm}\Big]\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li} =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} \widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{mn}\Big[\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}, \widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{no}\Big]\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{pm} + \widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{no}\Big[\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}, \widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{op}\Big]\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{pm}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li} =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} \delta_{lo}\delta_{in}\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{pm} - \delta_{lo}\delta_{kp}\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{pm}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li} =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} \delta_{lo}\delta_{in}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{pm} - \delta_{lo}\delta_{kp}\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{pm}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li} =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n} \widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{lm}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{ni} - \widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{lm}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{ni} =$$

$$= \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\alpha}\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}\widehat{X}^{\beta}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}\widehat{X}^{\beta}) - \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}\widehat{X}^{\beta}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}).$$

□

Proposition. *Pick nodes $a,b,c,d,e \in I$ such that (a,b,c,d) defines a 4-cycle. Assume that b and e are adjacent. Then one can choose Darboux coordinates so that:*



Proof. Set $\alpha := (a,b), \beta := (b,c), \gamma := (c,d), \varepsilon := (d,a)$ and $\zeta := (b,e)$. Then one has:

$$\big[\operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}\widehat{X}^{\beta}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}), \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\zeta^*}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*})\big] = \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} \big[\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}, \widehat{X}^{\zeta^*}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{pm}\big] =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} \widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\zeta^*}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{op}\big[\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}, \widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{pm}\big] = \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} \delta_{ip}\delta_{lm}\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\zeta^*}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{op} =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n} \widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\zeta^*}_{lm}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{ni} = \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}\widehat{X}^{\beta}\widehat{X}^{\zeta^*}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}).$$

□

Proposition. *Pick nodes $a,b,c,d,e \in I$ so that (a,b,c,d) and (a,b,c,e) define 4-cycles. One can choose Darboux coordinates so that:*



Proof. Denote $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \varepsilon)$ the arrows of the first cycle, and $(\alpha^*, \zeta, \eta, \beta^*)$ those of the second one. Then one has:

$$\Big[\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}\widehat{X}^{\beta}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}), \mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}\widehat{X}^{\eta}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*})\Big] = \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} \Big[\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}, \widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\eta}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{pm}\Big] =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} \widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\Big[\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}, \widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\eta}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{pm}\Big] =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} \widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}\Big[\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li}, \widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\eta}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{pm}\Big] + \widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\Big[\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}, \widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\eta}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{pm}\Big]\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li} =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} \widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\eta}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}_{op}\Big[\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{il}, \widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{pm}\Big] + \widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\Big[\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}, \widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{mn}\Big]\widehat{X}^{\eta}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{pm}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li} =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,m,n,o,p} \delta_{ip}\delta_{lm}\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\beta}_{kl}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}_{mn}\widehat{X}^{\eta}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}_{op} - \delta_{kn}\delta_{lm}\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}_{ij}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}_{jk}\widehat{X}^{\eta}_{no}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}_{op}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}_{pm}\widehat{X}^{\alpha}_{li} =$$

$$= \mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}\widehat{X}^{\beta}\widehat{X}^{\beta^*}\widehat{X}^{\eta}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}) - \mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{X}^{\varepsilon}\widehat{X}^{\gamma}\widehat{X}^{\eta}\widehat{X}^{\zeta}\widehat{X}^{\alpha^*}\widehat{X}^{\alpha})$$

□

Proof of Prop. 27.

Proposition. *The map* $\alpha : \mathrm{Tens}(\mathfrak{g}^0) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Tens}(T^*L_i)$*, defined by*

$$\alpha : e_{jk} \longmapsto \sum_m (f^i e)_{mk} \otimes (e f^i)_{jm},$$

induces an associative morphism $\widehat{\varphi} : U(\mathfrak{g}^0) \longrightarrow W(T^*L_i, \omega_a^{\mathrm{op}})$*, where* ω_a^{op} *is the opposite symplectic structure.*

Proof. Thanks to the universal property of the quotient, it is enough to show that one has $\alpha(I_1) \subseteq J^{\mathrm{op}}_{\omega_a}$. Here $J^{\mathrm{op}}_{\omega_a} \subseteq \mathrm{Tens}(T^*L_i)$ is the bilateral ideal generated by

$$x \otimes y - y \otimes x - \omega_a^{\mathrm{op}}(x, y) = x \otimes y - y \otimes x + \omega_a(x, y),$$

for $x, y \in \mathbb{M}$, and $I_1 \subseteq U(\mathfrak{g}^0)$ is the bilateral ideal generated by

$$v \otimes w - w \otimes v - [v, w],$$

for $v, w \in \mathfrak{g}^0$. This can be shown on the usual bases $\{e_{jk}\}_{j,k} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}^0$, $\{(ef^i)_{jk}\}_{j,k} \subseteq L_i$ and $\{(f^ie)_{jk}\}_{j,k} \subseteq L_i^*$. One has:

$$\alpha\big(e_{jk}\otimes e_{lm} - e_{lm}\otimes e_{jk} - [e_{jk}, e_{lm}]\big) = \alpha\big(e_{jk}\otimes e_{lm} - e_{lm}\otimes e_{jk} - \delta_{kl}e_{jm} + \delta_{jm}e_{lk}\big) =$$
$$= \sum_{n,o}\big[(f^ie)_{nk}\otimes(ef^i)_{jn}, (f^ie)_{om}\otimes(ef^i)_{lo}\big] - \delta_{kl}\delta_{no}(f^ie)_{om}\otimes(ef^i)_{jn} + \delta_{jm}\delta_{no}(f^ie)_{nk}\otimes(ef^i)_{lo} =$$
$$= \sum_{n,o}(f^ie)_{nk}\otimes\Big(\big[(ef^i)_{jn}, (f^ie)_{om}\big] + \omega_a\big((ef^i)_{jn}, (f^ie)_{om}\big)\Big)\otimes(ef^i)_{lo} +$$
$$+ \sum_{n,o}(f^ie)_{om}\otimes\Big(\big[(f^ie)_{nk}, (ef^i)_{lo}\big] + \omega_a\big((f^ie)_{nk}, (ef^i)_{lo}\big)\Big)\otimes(ef^i)_{jn} +$$
$$+ \sum_{n,o}(f^ie)_{nk}\otimes(f^ie)_{om}\otimes\Big(\big[(ef^i)_{jn}, (ef^i)_{lo}\big] + \omega_a\big((ef^i)_{jn}, (ef^i)_{lo}\big)\Big) +$$
$$+ \sum_{n,o}\Big(\big[(f^ie)_{nk}, (f^ie)_{om}\big] + \omega_a\big((f^ie)_{nk}, (f^ie)_{om}\big)\Big)\otimes(ef^i)_{lo}\otimes(ef^i)_{jn}.$$

This expansion follows from the Leibnitz rule for the commutator of $\mathrm{Tens}(T^*L_i)$, and from the canonical relations

$$\omega_a\big((ef^i)_{jn}, (f^ie)_{om}\big) = \delta_{jm}\delta_{no}, \qquad \omega_a\big((f^ie)_{nk}, (ef^i)_{lo}\big) = -\delta_{kl}\delta_{no},$$
$$\omega_a\big((ef^i)_{jn}, (ef^i)_{lo}\big) = 0 = \omega_a\big((f^ie)_{nk}, (f^ie)_{om}\big).$$

At the end one has four addends, each of which is a (bilateral) $\mathrm{Tens}(T^*L_i)$-linear combination of generators of $J^{\mathrm{op}}_{\omega_a}$. Hence the result lies in the ideal, by definition. □

Proof of Prop. 29.

Proposition. *One has*

$$\big[\widehat{\mu}^*_0\big(U(\mathfrak{gl}(W^0))\big), \widehat{\mu}^*_\infty\big(U(\mathfrak{gl}(W^\infty))\big)\big]_A = 0.$$

Proof. One has, using the usual generators:

$$\big[\widehat{\mu^*}_0(\widehat{de}_{ij}), \widehat{\mu^*}_\infty(\widehat{df}_{kl})\big]_A = \sum_{m,n}\big[\widehat{d(ef)}_{im}\cdot\widehat{d(fe)}_{mj}, \widehat{d(fe)}_{kn}\cdot\widehat{d(ef)}_{nl}\big]_A =$$
$$= \sum_{m,n}\widehat{d(ef)}_{im}\cdot\widehat{d(fe)}_{kn}\cdot\big[\widehat{d(fe)}_{mj}, \widehat{d(ef)}_{nl}\big]_A + \big[\widehat{d(ef)}_{im}, \widehat{d(fe)}_{kn}\big]_A\cdot\widehat{d(ef)}_{nl}\cdot\widehat{d(fe)}_{mj} =$$
$$= \sum_{m,n} -\delta_{ml}\delta_{jn}\widehat{d(ef)}_{im}\cdot\widehat{d(fe)}_{kn} + \delta_{in}\delta_{mk}\widehat{d(ef)}_{nl}\cdot\widehat{d(fe)}_{mj} =$$
$$= -\widehat{d(ef)}_{il}\cdot\widehat{d(fe)}_{kj} + \widehat{d(ef)}_{il}\cdot\widehat{d(fe)}_{kj} = 0.$$

□

.

References

[Bau99] Pierre Baumann. The q-Weyl group of a q-Schur algebra, 1999, hal-00143359.

[BLB02] Raf Bocklandt and Lieven Le Bruyn. Necklace Lie algebras and noncommutative symplectic geometry. *Math. Z.*, 240(1):141–167, 2002.

[Boa01] Philip Boalch. Symplectic manifolds and isomonodromic deformations. *Adv. Math.*, 163(2):137–205, 2001.

[Boa02] Philip P. Boalch. G-bundles, isomonodromy, and quantum Weyl groups. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, (22):1129–1166, 2002.

[Boa12] Philip Boalch. Simply-laced isomonodromy systems. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, 116:1–68, 2012.

[Egs15] Jens Kristian Egsgaard. *Hitchin connections for genus 0 quantum representation.* PhD thesis, Centre for Quantum Geometry of Moduli Spaces, Aarhus University, 2015.

[Eti07] Pavel Etingof. *Calogero-Moser systems and representation theory.* Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2007.

[FMTV00] G. Felder, Y. Markov, V. Tarasov, and A. Varchenko. Differential equations compatible with KZ equations. *Math. Phys. Anal. Geom.*, 3(2):139–177, 2000.

[Har94] J. Harnad. Dual isomonodromic deformations and moment maps to loop algebras. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 166(2):337–365, 1994.

[How89] Roger Howe. Remarks on classical invariant theory. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 313(2):539–570, 1989.

[JMMS80] Michio Jimbo, Tetsuji Miwa, Yasuko Môri, and Mikio Sato. Density matrix of an impenetrable Bose gas and the fifth Painlevé transcendent. *Phys. D*, 1(1):80–158, 1980.

[JMU81] Michio Jimbo, Tetsuji Miwa, and Kimio Ueno. Monodromy preserving deformation of linear ordinary differential equations with rational coefficients. I. General theory and τ-function. *Phys. D*, 2(2):306–352, 1981.

[JNS08] M. Jimbo, H. Nagoya, and J. Sun. Remarks on the confluent KZ equation for $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ and quantum Painlevé equations. *J. Phys. A*, 41(17):175205, 14, 2008.

[Kar89] M. V. Karasëv. The Maslov quantization conditions in higher cohomology and analogs of notions developed in Lie theory for canonical fibre bundles of symplectic manifolds. I, II. *Selecta Math. Soviet.*, 8(3):213–234, 235–258, 1989. Translated from the Russian by Pavel Buzytsky, Selected translations.

[KZ84] V. G. Knizhnik and A. B. Zamolodchikov. Current algebra and Wess-Zumino model in two dimensions. *Nuclear Phys. B*, 247(1):83–103, 1984.

[MTL05] John J. Millson and Valerio Toledano Laredo. Casimir operators and monodromy representations of generalised braid groups. *Transform. Groups*, 10(2):217–254, 2005.

[NS11] Hajime Nagoya and Juanjuan Sun. Confluent KZ equations for $\mathfrak{sl}_N$ with Poincaré rank 2 at infinity. *J. Phys. A*, 44(28):285205, 17, 2011.

[NY14] Hajime Nagoya and Yasuhiko Yamada. Symmetries of quantum Lax equations for the Painlevé equations. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 15(2):313–344, 2014.

[Res92] Nicolai Reshetikhin. The Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov system as a deformation of the isomonodromy problem. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 26(3):167–177, 1992.

[TL02] Valerio Toledano Laredo. A Kohno-Drinfeld theorem for quantum Weyl groups. *Duke Math. J.*, 112(3):421–451, 2002.

Université Paris-Saclay, Laboratoire de Mathématiques d'Orsay
E-mail address: gabriele.rembado@math.u-psud.fr